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# Introduction

**Instructions**

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State’s systems designed to drive improved results for students with disabilities and to ensure that the State Educational Agency (SEA) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) meet the requirements of IDEA Part B. This introduction must include descriptions of the State’s General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

## Intro - Indicator Data

**Executive Summary**

The Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDOE), like all other State Educational Agencies (“SEAs”), is required to establish and maintain an effective system of general supervision under 34 CFR §300.600. Hence, the Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE)/State Office of Special Education (SOSE) developed its general supervision system, consisting of eight components, as discussed in the preceding section of this document. The State Office of Special Education (“SOSE”) as the SEA, is required, according to 34 CFR §300.600 (a) – (d), to monitor and report on each Local Educational Agency’s (“LEA”) implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA) [20 USC § 1416(a)]. In addition, the VIDE/SOSE’s Continuous Improvement Results-Focused Monitoring System (CIRFMS) is designed to promote improved educational outcomes for students with disabilities while ensuring the State meets the procedural and compliance requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEIA). As noted in the VIDE/SOSE’s State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR) submitted in February 2022 (FFY2020), the VIDE is continuing to experience infrastructural challenges of the COVID-19 global pandemic, which impacted the delivery of academic instructions for FFY 2021 (2021-22 school year) for students with and without disabilities.

**Additional information related to data collection and reporting**

The VIDE/SOSE has developed a comprehensive data system that enables the Territory to collect, analyze, and report timely, valid, and reliable Section 616 and Section 618 data as required by the IDEIA. The State's Part B Data Manager coordinates all data collection, analysis, and reporting requirements within special education. The Part B Data Manager works closely with personnel from the Office of Planning, Research Development (PRE), the VIDE division responsible for collecting, housing, and reporting all data based on numerous Federal and Territorial regulations. Additionally, the Data Manager provides ongoing technical assistance to each LEA to ensure they meet all reporting requirements and provide the necessary data clarifications and updates on revisions/changes to reporting requirements of all 618 and 619 data.   
collection and reporting for the Virgin Islands Department of Education. However, to optimize the collection and reporting capabilities for student level, compliance, results, and Section 616 and Section 618 data.   
  
For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE commenced with the preparation for the conversion to an improved online web-based special education student data management system (“EDPlan”) To ensure that all revisions and upgrades met the requirements of the United States Department of Education(USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP). The VIDE/SOSE met weekly with the vendors of EDPlan and discussed questions and concerns and status updates. The VIDE/SOSE hosted multiple virtual and onsite training in each LEA for all State Office of Special Education personnel, administrators, special education teachers, school social workers, psychologists, physical, occupational, and speech and language therapists, and paraprofessionals, to ensure proper use and understanding of the system's features. More importantly, SOSE worked directly with the vendor to provide "real-time" assistance to users.  
  
Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to work closely with each LEA and other special education personnel to garner input relative to system refinements, further, all revisions and upgrades to the newly introduced EDPlan system will continue to be followed by Intensive training and technical assistance regarding the use of EDPlan, the audience for the training to VIDE/SOSE and to LEA personnel. This web-based system (“EDPlan has numerous business rules with corresponding built-in edit checks which promote high levels of data quality. Additionally, this newly adapted system produces the following; all system-specific special education documents in the native language of parents/guardians and students, data for required public reporting, and more specifically its ability to serve as a primary data source for all monitoring activities. Each year, the VIDE/SOSE personnel conducts on-site monitoring visits in each of the LEAs for previous FFYs personnel to verify that data in GoalView is consistent with the information contained in the students’ IEPs and other associated records. However, commencing in FFY 2022 (School Year 2022/233) VIDE/SOSE personnel will use EDPlan to conduct this monitoring event. More importantly, updates are implemented in accordance with the regulation and in consultation with the LEAs. Furthermore, in some instances, additional data are obtained from the VIDE’s Student Information System (SIS) “PowerSchool”. This comprehensive SIS serves as the VIDE primary collection tool for a variety of data collections including, but not limited to, enrollment data, assessment data, attendance data, co-teaching assignments, and discipline events and the accompanying incidences. The State Office of Special Education, Part B Data Manager works closely with personnel from the PRE and directors of Data and Assessment in each LEA to access data needed for 618 special education reporting such as assessment, enrollment, discipline, additional school-level demographic data, and iReady diagnostic data.

**Number of Districts in your State/Territory during reporting year**

2

**General Supervision System:**

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.**

In 2005, the VIDE/SOSE developed a State Performance Plan (SPP) that serves as an accountability mechanism for the Territory and the two Local Education Agencies' (LEAs) efforts to implement the requirements and purposes of IDEIA. This Plan describes how the Territory will improve the implementation of the IDEIA over time, and currently includes seventeen indicators that provide a measurable indication of the VIDE’s performance in specific legal priority areas under Part B. Some indicators reflect compliance requirements while others focus on improving results for students with disabilities (SWD). For each indicator, the VIDE/SOSE provides baseline data, targets, and the corresponding timelines established by the state. However, in FFY 2013, the SPP and APR were merged into one document and it was submitted online annually in the specially designed platform, GRADS360 until recently. The submission process will continue in an online mode, however, beginning in February 2020, (FFY 2018), the newly designed module within the current EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS) platform will be utilized.   
  
Each year, the VIDE/SOSE reports its performance on the target of its seventeen (17) indicators identified in the SPP/APR. Together, the SPP and APR provide a robust foundation and a blueprint for the work of the VIDE/SOSE implementation and purposes of IDEIA.   
  
Personnel within the VIDE/SOSE are assigned clusters of indicators and are individually responsible for collecting, and analyzing data, crafting/drafting responses, working collaboratively with the State Part B Data Manager in sharing the current progress with meeting targets with internal and external stakeholders, the Virgin Islands Panel on Special Education (VIAPSE), and evaluating implementation for each indicator. More importantly, the VIDE/SOSE engages Stakeholders/Advisory Panel Members in the annual development of the SPP/APR. Advisory Panel members review indicator data, specifically trend data, and assist the VIDE/SOSE in establishing or revising as necessary, targets for each indicator. Furthermore, External and CORE internal stakeholders have and continue to play a pivotal role in developing the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), a new indicator in FFY 2013, and were developed in phases with accompanying implementation years. Until FFY 2019, the SSIP was reported annually in April however, beginning in FFY 2019 (School Year 2019/20) Phase IV Year 6 implementation the submission was changed to February 1st in line with its APR.

**Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.**

The VIDE/SOSE continue to provide differentiated technical assistance to each LEA to support them in achieving and maintaining the regulatory requirements of IDEIA. This technical assistance aims to assist them in implementing programs, practices, and instructional strategies that lead to improved outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. IDEIA program Information and technical assistance are shared through the following formats; email, virtual and face-to-face meetings, and conference calls.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE provides general technical assistance (GTA) to district and school administrators, special education and general education teachers and paraprofessionals, and other educational personnel in both LEAs on research-based topics that impact the provision of special education and related services. These (GTA) include, but are not limited to VIDE/SOSE’s updated special education management system (EDPlan), local budget applications, and areas for improvement of specific compliance and results Indicators within the VIDE/SOSE’s APR/SSIP and/or other areas of concern derived from qualitative or quantitative data.   
  
Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) is based on the VIDE/SOSE use of LEA performance and compliance data from the SPP/APR indicators as well as other monitoring activities to identify technical assistance needs. Participation in TTA activities may be voluntary however, participation may also be required as in the case of TTA that is required as a part of an LEA's CAP that is developed secondary to the identification of non-compliance. Both LEAs have and continue to receive targeted TTA related to meeting the requirements in Indicators 4, 9, 10, 12, and 13 of the SPP/APR. LEAs are also encouraged and also reserve the right to request additional TA in identified areas of need. The Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE) provides a portal to SOSE on the department’s main website. This portal is utilized for posting information for public viewing and Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) public reporting requirements.

**Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for children with disabilities.**

The Virgin Islands Department of Education/State Office of Special Education (VIDE/SOSE) maintains a comprehensive system of professional development that strikes a balance between improving compliant practices related to the regulatory requirements of IDEA and supporting Educators in the implementation of evidence-based practices that lead to improved outcomes for students with disabilities. Professional development is provided by VIDE/SOSE's team, technical assistance providers from OSEP-funded centers, and private consultants. Prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic, most professional learning occurred on-site through face-to-face professional development sessions. During the 2021-2022 school year, the VIDE/SOSE was able to provide professional development opportunities on a smaller scale to school base personnel. The VIDE/SOSE continues to collaborate with the LEAs to explore ways to improve online learning accessibility for teachers, administrators, and paraprofessionals. Additionally, School Improvement Teams/Data Chat teams have been established at several schools which provide an avenue for sharing information (e.g. instructional strategies, data interpretation, effective classroom practices) with school personnel.  
  
For many years, a significant amount of professional development focused on meeting the requirements related to secondary transition as reported in Indicator 13, however, the VIDE/SOSE has expanded its technical assistance and professional development focus and has obtained professional development and support from the following technical assistance centers, the National Technical Assistance Center in Transition (NTACT), Center for IDEIA Fiscal Reporting( CIFR), Early Childhood Technical Assistance (“ECTA Center”), SRI Education a Division of International Research Center, IDEA Data Center (IDC), Center for Appropriate Dispute Resolution in Special Education (CADRE), National Center for Systemic Improvement, (NCSI) and the Center IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems(DaSy), and the Technical Assistance for Excellence in Special Education (TAESE) and then customized this training for district personnel. The VIDE/SOSE continues to work diligently to identify and provide heightened professional development to teachers and other school-based personnel in each LEA related to APR indicators, including its SSIP.

**Broad Stakeholder Input:**

**The mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the State’s targets in the SPP/APR and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 17, the State’s Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The mechanisms used by the VIDE/SOSE for soliciting broad stakeholder input are as follows:  
  
Host Quarterly Meetings (virtual or in-person) with internal and external stakeholders which includes parents of children with disabilities, children and youth with disabilities, grade level and content experts, early childhood personnel, district superintendents district directors, supervisors, coordinators, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic team members, private business sector, interagency partners, and other outside and linking agencies.   
  
Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE partner with other family and community agencies (Meet and Greet) to share information and provide relevant updates pertaining to the VIDE's APR, SSIP, and other pertinent IDEA-related services. In addition, the VIDE/SOSE disseminates information via Public Service Announcements and email correspondence highlighting the locations and highlight prospective activities aligned with the VIDE/SOSE's APR as well as the locations of State and District Offices.   
  
For FFY 2021(School Year), the VIDE/SOSE presented its members with indicator measurement language, baseline data, and targets. Moreover, Indicator target and performance data for FFY 2020 (School Year 2019/2020) was also shared to aid stakeholders with identifying improvement strategies geared towards improving performance and measuring advancement for all Part B Indicators.

**Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part B results indicators (y/n)**

NO

**Number of Parent Members:**

35

**Parent Members Engagement:**

**Describe how the parent members of the State Advisory Panel, parent center staff, parents from local and statewide advocacy and advisory committees, and individual parents were engaged in setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

Since the inception of the VIDE/SOSE’s SPP/APR, and State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders have been a primary mechanism for disseminating, analyzing, and developing strategies and revisions across all SPP/APR indicators. The components of the State’s Stakeholders group continue to be expanded. As such, the broadening of the scope for soliciting input, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress required a more equitable representation. Thus, ensuring the representativeness of the demographic of a segment of the population such as parents of students with disabilities who receive special services and related services is the impetus for the development of the newly revised broad indicator cluster stakeholders group.  
  
As mentioned for FFY 2019, 2020, and 2021 (School Years 2019/20, 2020/21) and 2021/22) parent stakeholder members are part of the State’s broad stakeholder groups, and the general public was invited to participate in the dissemination of data collected through the UVI/ECC State’s Parental Satisfaction Survey. This method of presentation is one of the various mechanisms the VIDE/SOSE utilizes to inform its stakeholders of the progress and outcomes of the delivery of services for children and youth with disabilities. The presentation offered the general public, parents/guardians, and broad stakeholder groups data and analysis of approximately seventy (70) items that are classified into ten (10) groups or sub-scales, each of which addresses a particular aspect of parental satisfaction. Another method to disseminate information to stakeholders was the results of the State’s FFY 2020 CIRFMS. The data collected during this phase of the general supervision process provided stakeholders with valuable information on performance and outcomes data. Moreover, the results enabled every member of the indicator cluster groups a close-up look at how each cluster informs the delivery of services for children with disabilities.

**Activities to Improve Outcomes for Children with Disabilities:**

**The activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents to support the development of implementation activities designed to improve outcomes for children with disabilities.**

Since the pandemic, parent engagement has decreased across all student populations. Though state and district entities have provided numerous opportunities for engagement, parents have been reluctant to participate. However, state and district leadership have initiated various activities to increase engagement, such as neighborhood visits, community connect virtual town halls, and workshops that provide creative lessons and projects for advancement. These activities offer an array of opportunities for parents to meet, discuss and provide meaningful feedback on improving outcomes for students with disabilities. Additionally, twice a year, parents have an opportunity to meet with educators, community business stakeholders, and legislators in a social setting to discuss relevant and pressing issues affecting student performance.

**Soliciting Public Input:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.**

The mechanisms used by the VIDESOSE for soliciting public input for setting targets, analyzing data, developing improvement strategies, and evaluating progress.   
  
1. Broad Indicator Cluster Stakeholders Group:  
2. Continuous Improvement and Results Focus Monitoring System (CIRFMS) (conducted and reported annually for corresponding FFY and school year)  
3. Districts’ Annual Determination (Report generated and disseminated in September of current school calendar)  
4. District Performance Profiles (Report generated and disseminated in September of current school calendar)  
5. Quarterly Broad Stakeholder Meetings (Meetings on March, June, September, and December of the current school calendar)  
6. VIAPSE Meetings (Meetings on February, May, August, and November of the current school calendar)  
7. Annual Parental Satisfaction Survey (Public report generated and disseminated annually during a public presentation).

**Making Results Available to the Public:**

**The mechanisms and timelines for making the results of the target setting, data analysis, development of the improvement strategies, and evaluation available to the public.**

The VIDE/SOSE will continue to utilize the activities listed in Table D of the SSIP as the mechanism and roadmap for implementation evaluation criteria for state-level activities. These mechanisms include, but are not limited to engaging strategically with other VIDE programs, Territory linking agencies, LEAs, and external organizations/ programs/groups, including family and community groups to increase stakeholder engagement in educational decision-making. These activities will occur quarterly, as well as on an as-needed basis.

**Reporting to the Public**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2020 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State’s submission of its FFY 2020 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State’s SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2020 APR in 2022, is available.**

As required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A) the VIDE/SOSE’s public reporting for FFY 2020 of each LEAs performance can be accessed by using the following link.  
  
https://vide.vi/our-divisions/special-education/#district-profiles

## Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions

The State's IDEA Part B determination for both 2021 and 2022 is Needs Assistance. In the State's 2022 determination letter, the Department advised the State of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the State to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the State to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The State must report, with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the State received assistance; and (2) the actions the State took as a result of that technical assistance.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with The IDEA Data Center (IDC), National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT), Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA), and the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast & Islands (RELNEI) to support and improve effective practices and to build capacity throughout the State. As a result of their support, VIDE/SOSE has revised training mechanisms to address immediate and potential risks. Furthermore, a system of shared ownership and accessibility to platforms that strengthened educational practices has been implemented. LEAs are now able to tier program applications and for a more comprehensive configuration of program implementation.

## Intro - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands determinations for both 2021 and 2022 were Needs Assistance. Pursuant to section 616(e)(1) of the IDEA and 34 C.F.R. § 300.604(a), OSEP's June 24, 2022, determination letter informed the Virgin Islands that it must report with its FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2023, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Virgin Islands received assistance; and (2) the actions the Virgin Islands took as a result of that technical assistance. The Virgin Islands provided the required information.  
  
The Virgin Islands did not describe the mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on the targets in the SPP/APR and subsequent revisions that the Virgin Islands made to those targets. Specifically, the Virgin Islands did not report a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents.  
  
The Department imposed Specific Conditions on the Virgin Island's IDEA Part B grant awards for the last three or more years. Those conditions are in effect at the time of the Department’s 2023 determination.

## Intro - Required Actions

The Virgin Islands has not provided a description of the activities conducted to increase the capacity of diverse groups of parents. In its FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must provide the required information.  
  
The Virgin Island's IDEA Part B determination for both 2022 and 2023 is Needs Assistance. In the Virgin Island's 2023 determination letter, the Department advised the Virgin Islands of available sources of technical assistance, including OSEP-funded technical assistance centers, and required the Virgin Islands to work with appropriate entities. The Department directed the Virgin Islands to determine the results elements and/or compliance indicators, and improvement strategies, on which it will focus its use of available technical assistance, in order to improve its performance. The Virgin Islands must report, with its FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, due February 1, 2024, on: (1) the technical assistance sources from which the Virgin Islands received assistance; and (2) the actions the Virgin Islands took as a result of that technical assistance.

# Indicator 1: Graduation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) exiting special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

**Measurement**

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited high school (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma are different, please explain.

## 1 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[1]](#footnote-2)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 54.63% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 38.00% | 41.00% | 44.00% | 44.50% | 54.63% |
| Data | 52.58% | 53.21% | 49.53% | 46.99% | 54.63% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 55.00% | 55.50% | 56.00% | 56.50% | 57.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

During FFY 2021 (school year 2020-2021), the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder components with a concentrated focus on indicator clusters to ensure expert representation and analyses in all target areas of this indicator and all indicators in this cluster. This reconfiguration includes but it not limited to the following: parents of students with disabilities, grade level and content experts in secondary transition services, regular and special education personnel, district directors, district coordinators and supervisor, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic personnel, private business sector, inter-agency partners, and other outside and linking agencies. The VIDE/SOSE divided the stakeholders into cluster groups.   
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the data for FFY 2020 and implement ongoing continued improvement strategies to increase the graduation rates for children with disabilities. The stakeholders for this cluster were tasked with an analyses of the FFY 2020 data. Stakeholders were tasked with identifying areas for improvements geared towards ensuring children with disabilities were afforded FAPE and services in the LRE. Stakeholders were provided with historical data as well as targets for 2021 through 2025. Stakeholders discussed strategies to increase graduation rates, decrease drop out rates, write effective IEPs and increase representativeness of the demographic of post school responders, especially, increasing the total number responders, particularly for underrepresented groups, and identifying potential response bias as well as provide strategies to reduce response bias for youth who had IEPs and were no longer in secondary school. A comparative analysis of Target Leaver and Respondent Representation for all leavers in the FFY 2020 data were carefully reviewed to determine the conditions needed for a higher response rate and reducing response bias. This process allowed stakeholders to select a demographic groups for responder’s representativeness as required for FFY 2021. The Stakeholders analyzes captured that most responders demonstrated outcomes that were effective and it was concluded that effectiveness or positive outcomes contributed to a higher likelihood of responders responding to the survey. Stakeholders for this cluster were given a description of the State Post School Outcome (PSO) calculator. A detailed description about the data elements and displays were provided. The State enters data and analyzes the data for this indicator through the State’s PSO calculator, the calculator produces tabular and graphical presentation from data entered on excel worksheets. The data shows the response rate disaggregated by disability group, gender, race/ethnicity and exiting modes. The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator approved the analysis of the demographic of response representativeness by the disability category of Specific Learning Disabled (SLD) and recommended increasing the networking with other transition agencies to provide direct services to students who exit in any other mode other than receiving a high school diploma or certificate of completion.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 48 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 17 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 15 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 48 | 80 | 54.63% | 55.00% | 60.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Graduation Conditions**

**Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma.**

The requirements for all students to graduate with a high school diploma, including students with disabilities, are a follows: Students must earn a minimum of 26 Carnegie units from grades 9-12. Twenty one (21) of the Carnegie units must be earned in specific required courses, delineated below, and the other 5 Carnegie units are earned in elective courses. All students must achieve a grade of 70% or better in each required course and in each elective to earn course credit (Carnegie Unit) toward graduation with a high school diploma. Students are required to complete 100 hours of community service to graduate.  
  
Specific course requirements for graduation are:  
English- 4 Carnegie Units  
Science, including general Science and Biology- 3 Carnegie Units  
Mathematics, including Algebra and Geometry- 3 Carnegie Units  
Social Studies, including Virgin Islands History, Caribbean History, and U.S. History-(1 Carnegie Unit per course for a total of 3 Carnegie Units)  
Foreign Language (Spanish or French)- 2 Carnegie Units  
Computer Science- 1 Carnegie Unit  
Physical Education- 2 Carnegie Units  
Health- 1 Carnegie Unit  
Home Economics or Industrial Arts- 1 Carnegie Unit  
Developmental Reading/Developmental Writing or Speech- 1 Carnegie Unit

**Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The VIDE/SOSE used the same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.  
  
Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to graduating with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)  
  
Calculation: 48 / 80 = 60.00%  
  
During FFY 2021, (SY 2020-2021), the VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators by engaging in ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners and through these channels engaging the districts’ in continued collaboration and professional technical development. This along with ongoing monitoring of writing effective IEPs, ensuring provisions of coordinated related services are implemented, and rigorous reviews of monthly exiting profiles have all lend themselves very useful in providing the districts with the most effective practices to promote effective student centered outcomes. In building capacity and guiding the districts, the VIDE/SOSE continues to promote the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

## 1 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 1 - OSEP Response

## 1 - Required Actions

# Indicator 2: Drop Out

**Instructions and Measurement**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Data Source

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS009.

Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR that was submitted on February 1, 2012.

Measurement

States must report a percentage using the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out in the numerator and the number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21) in the denominator.

Instructions

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Data for this indicator are “lag” data. Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), and compare the results to the target.

Include in the denominator the following exiting categories: (a) graduated with a regular high school diploma; (b) graduated with a

state-defined alternate diploma; (c) received a certificate; (d) reached maximum age; or (e) dropped out.

Do not include in the denominator the number of youths with IEPs who exited special education due to: (a) transferring to regular education; or (b) who moved but are known to be continuing in an educational program.

Use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistic's Common Core of Data.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth. Please explain if there is a difference between what counts as dropping out for all students and what counts as dropping out for students with IEPs.

## 2 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data[[2]](#footnote-3)**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 30.56% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 4.00% | 3.75% | 3.75% | 3.75% | 30.56% |
| Data | 5.14% | 7.64% | 6.80% | 5.37% | 30.56% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 29.00% | 28.00% | 27.00% | 26.00% | 25.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

During FFY 2021 (school year 2020-2021), the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder components with a concentrated focus on indicator clusters to ensure expert representation and analyses in all target areas of this indicator and all indicators in this cluster. This reconfiguration includes but it not limited to the following: parents of students with disabilities, grade level and content experts in secondary transition services, regular and special education personnel, district directors, district coordinators and supervisor, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic personnel, private business sector, inter-agency partners, and other outside and linking agencies. The VIDE/SOSE divided the stakeholders into cluster groups.   
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the data for FFY 2020 and implement ongoing continued improvement strategies to decrease the drop out rates for children with disabilities. The stakeholders for this cluster were tasked with an analyses of the FFY 2020 data. Stakeholders were tasked with identifying areas for improvements geared towards ensuring children with disabilities were afforded FAPE and services in the LRE. Stakeholders were provided with historical data as well as targets for 2021 through 2025. Stakeholders discussed strategies to increase graduation rates, decrease drop out rates, write effective IEPs and increase representativeness of the demographic of post school responders, especially, increasing the total number responders, particularly for underrepresented groups, and identifying potential response bias as well as provide strategies to reduce response bias for youth who had IEPs and were no longer in secondary school. A comparative analysis of Target Leaver and Respondent Representation for all leavers in the FFY 2020 data were carefully reviewed to determine the conditions needed for a higher response rate and reducing response bias. This process allowed stakeholders to select a demographic groups for responder’s representativeness as required for FFY 2021. The Stakeholders analyzes captured that most responders demonstrated outcomes that were effective and it was concluded that effectiveness or positive outcomes contributed to a higher likelihood of responders responding to the survey. Stakeholders for this cluster were given a description of the State Post School Outcome (PSO) calculator. A detailed description about the data elements and displays were provided. The State enters data and analyzes the data for this indicator through the State’s PSO calculator, the calculator produces tabular and graphical presentation from data entered on excel worksheets. The data shows the response rate disaggregated by disability group, gender, race/ethnicity and exiting modes. The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator approved the analysis of the demographic of response representativeness by the disability category of Specific Learning Disabled (SLD) and recommended increasing the networking with other transition agencies to provide direct services to students who exit in any other mode other than receiving a high school diploma or certificate of completion.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a regular high school diploma (a) | 48 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by graduating with a state-defined alternate diploma (b) |  |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by receiving a certificate (c) | 17 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education by reaching maximum age (d) | 0 |
| SY 2020-21 Exiting Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS009; Data Group 85) | 05/25/2022 | Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out (e) | 15 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth with IEPs (ages 14-21) who exited special education due to dropping out** | **Number of all youth with IEPs who exited special education (ages 14-21)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 15 | 80 | 30.56% | 29.00% | 18.75% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth**

The VIDE/SOSE definition of dropout is a student who is enrolled at the beginning of the school year and who is not enrolled at the conclusion of that school year. The definition of dropout is the same for students without IEPs.

**Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? (yes/no)**

NO

**If yes, explain the difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs.**

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During FFY 2021 (SY 2020-2021), the VIDE/SOSE continues to work closely with the LEAs to ensure the best possible outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE implementation of the State Results Driven Accountability Exiting Report that requires each LEA to report monthly to the SOSE the names of students, schools, progress reports, and reason for exiting school prior to the end of that school year ensures the highest level of services that is oriented at ensuring that children with disabilities are afforded with the best exiting options furthermore, this system allows for academic remediation. This data will be utilized to assist each LEA with ensuring that every child that exits school in any manner other than receiving a high school diploma or certificate of completion is afforded with a selection of post school options and or strategies best suited to graduate high school.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators by engaging in ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners thus building capacity and guiding its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes. This along with ongoing monitoring of writing effective IEPs, ensuring provisions of coordinated related services are implemented, and rigorous reviews of monthly exiting profiles have all lend themselves very useful in providing the districts with the most effective practices to promote effective student centered outcomes. In building capacity and guiding the districts, the VIDE/SOSE continues to promote the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

## 2 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 2 - OSEP Response

## 2 - Required Actions

# Indicator 3A: Participation for Children with IEPs

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3A. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS185 and 188.

**Measurement**

A. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3A: Provide separate reading/language arts and mathematics participation rates for children with IEPs for each of the following grades: 4, 8, & high school. Account for ALL children with IEPs, in grades 4, 8, and high school, including children not participating in assessments and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 100.00% |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 93.94% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | x[[3]](#footnote-4) |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 100.00% |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 94.46% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | x3 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | 93.94% | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 95.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | x3 | 86.00% | 86.00% | 86.50% | 87.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 94.46% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.00% | 95.50% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | 87.78% | 88.00% | 88.00% | 88.50% | 88.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its Cluster Stakeholders group members specifically for Indicators 3, 5, and 17 in order to review and recommend targets that demonstrate improvements for this indicator over the 5-year targets of this SPP/APR. As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies. The State Cluster Stakeholders group members used the data collected and reported for this indicator to build a framework for building capacity within the State Curriculum and Instructions Literacy Improvement Plan and the VIDE School-Wide Strategic Improvement Plan designed to improve literacy outcomes for ELA and increase the proficiency rates in reading comprehension for children with disabilities in grades 3 as specified in the State Improvement Measurable Results. The Cluster Stakeholders reviewed the baseline data collected and reported for this indicator and made recommendations on the targets for improvement over the next 5 years of data collection for Reading and Math grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improvement targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 3, 5, and 17 (SSIP). The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator were reintroduced to the methodology and measurements which closely looks at the overall participation rate of children with IEPs.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS188; Data Group: 589)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 47 | 66 | x[[4]](#footnote-5) |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 13 | 10 | 13 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 29 | 43 | 43 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 5 | 9 | x4 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS185; Data Group: 588)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Participation Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs\* | 47 | 65 | x4 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations | 13 | 10 | 12 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations | 29 | 45 | 43 |
| d. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards | 5 | 9 | x4 |

\*The children with IEPs count excludes children with disabilities who were reported as exempt due to significant medical emergency in row a for all the prefilled data in this indicator.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 47 | 47 |  | 100.00% | 100.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 62 | 66 |  | 93.94% | 93.94% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x4 | x4 |  | x4 | x4 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Participating** | **Number of Children with IEPs** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | 47 | 47 |  | 100.00% | 100.00% | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 64 | 65 |  | 94.46% | 98.46% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x[[5]](#footnote-6) | x5 |  | x5 | x5 | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

https://vide.vi/blog/1949-school-report-card.html  
  
Instructions:   
Click on or paste the link provided above  
You will arrive at the School Report Card page  
Scroll to the bottom of the page and click on Transitional Report Card (School Year 2014-15 to 2021-2022)  
You will then arrive at the page that says Public Reports, scroll down until you see the heading Transitional Report Card

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The VIDE/SOSE is reporting For FFY 2021, (School Year 2021/22) for the first time using the new measurement on the participation rate this participation rate is only for children with disabilities in fourth (4th), eighth (8th), and eleventh (11th) as opposed to the participation rate inclusive of all grades levels, that is from third (3) through eight (8th) and eleventh (11th). Thus this year will serve as the VIDE/SOSE’s baseline year for the participation rate of children with disabilities in the following ages; fourth (4th), eighth (8th), and eleventh (11th).

## 3A - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3A - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts those revisions for Grade 4 Reading and Math, Grade 8 Reading and Math and High School Reading, but OSEP cannot accept that revision for High School Math because the FFY 2021 baseline data reported in the historical data table does not match the FFY 2021 data reported in the data table for High School Math.   
  
The Virgin Islands revised its targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions for Grade 4 Reading and Math, Grade 8 Reading and Math. However, OSEP cannot accept the Virgin Islands revised targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for High School Reading and Math because the Virgin Islands' targets do not align with ESEA requirements.   
  
The Virgin Islands did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the Virgin Islands reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). Specifically, the Virgin Islands has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) is noncompliance.

## 3A - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR the Virgin Islands must provide updated baseline data for FFY 2021 for High School Math, as required by the Measurement Table.  
  
The Virgin Islands did not provide targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for High School Reading and Math that align with ESEA requirements. The Virgin Islands must provide FFYs 2021 through 2025 targets for High School Reading and Math in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.   
  
Within 90 days of the receipt of the Virgin Islands' 2023 determination letter, Virgin Islands must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2021, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the Virgin Islands that in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 C.F.R. § 300.160(f) for FFY 2022.

# Indicator 3B: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3B. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

B. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3B: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the regular assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3B - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | x[[6]](#footnote-7) |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2022 | 3.77% |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2023 | 1.79% |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | x6 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2022 | 0.00% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2023 | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | x6 | 3.00% | 4.00% | 5.00% | 6.00% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | x6 | 4.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% | 5.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | x6 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 4.00% | 4.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | x6 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 3.50% | 4.00% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | x6 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 3.50% | 4.00% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | x6 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 3.50% | 4.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its Cluster Stakeholders group members specifically for Indicators 3, 5, and 17 in order to review and recommend targets that demonstrate improvements for this indicator over the 5-year targets of this SPP/APR. As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies. The VIDE/SOSE Cluster Stakeholders group members used the data collected and reported for this indicator to build a framework for building capacity within the State Curriculum and Instructions Literacy Improvement Plan and the VIDE School-Wide Strategic Improvement Plan designed to improve literacy outcomes for ELA and increase the proficiency rates in reading comprehension for children with disabilities in grades 3 as specified in the State Improvement Measurable Results. The Cluster Stakeholders reviewed the baseline data collected and reported for this indicator and made recommendations on the targets for improvement over the next 5 years of data collection for Reading in grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11. The Stakeholders verified the data collected and reported for this indicator and agreed to use the baseline data reported to revise and propose new target data over the next 5 years that represents an improvement over the baseline data for Reading in grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11. Furthermore, the Stakeholders agreed to remove the targets for Math grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11 presented during this APR submission and made clarification as required by OSEP Response. The Stakeholders agreed that the data entered as (0) for Math grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11 are valid and reliable data. Moreover, the Stakeholders agreed and proposed new target data for these measurements that will demonstrate improvement over the baseline data.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improvement targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 3, 5, and 17 (SSIP). The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator were reintroduced to the methodology and measurements which closely looks at the overall proficiency of children with IEPs against grade-level academic achievement standards.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 42 | 53 | 56 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x[[7]](#footnote-8) | x7 | x7 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x7 | x7 | x7 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the regular assessment | 42 | 55 | 55 |
| b. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x7 | x7 | x7 |
| c. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x7 | x7 | x7 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x[[8]](#footnote-9) | 42 |  | x8 | x8 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x8 | 53 |  | x8 | x8 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x8 | 56 |  | x8 | x8 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Regular Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x8 | 42 |  | x8 | x8 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x8 | 55 |  | x8 | x8 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x8 | 55 |  | x8 | x8 | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**  
**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

https://vide.vi/blog/1949-school-report-card.html  
  
Instructions:   
Click on or paste the link provided above  
You will arrive at the School Report Card page  
 Scroll to the bottom of the page and click on Transitional Report Card (School Year 2014-15 to 2021-2022)  
You will then arrive at the page that says Public Reports, scroll down until you see the heading Transitional Report Card

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3B - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3B - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021 for Grade 4 Reading and Grade 4 Math, and OSEP accepts that revision.   
   
The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2022 for Grade 8 Reading and FFY 2023 for High School Reading, and data from FFY 2022 for Grade 8 Math and FFY 2023 for High School Math, but OSEP cannot accept those revisions because these data have not yet been collected and reported. Therefore, OSEP could not accept Virgin Islands' targets for Grade 8 Reading and High School Reading, and Grade 8 Math and High School Math.

## 3B - Required Actions

The Virgin Islands did not provide baseline data for Grade 8 Reading and Math and High School Reading and Math, and targets for FFYs 2021 through 2025 for Grade 8 Reading and Math and High School Reading and Math, as required by the Measurement Table. The Virgin Islands must provide the required baseline and targets through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR.

# Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Children with IEPs (Alternate Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3C. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

C. Proficiency rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), i.e., a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3C: Proficiency calculations in this SPP/APR must result in proficiency rates for children with IEPs on the alternate assessment in reading/language arts and mathematics assessments (separately) in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time

of testing.

## 3C - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | x[[9]](#footnote-10) |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | x13 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | x13 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | x13 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 44.44% |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | x13 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A >= | Grade 4 | x13 | 60.00% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 61.50% |
| Reading | B >= | Grade 8 | x13 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 3.00% | 5.00% |
| Reading | C >= | Grade HS | x13 | 2.00% | 3.00% | 3.00% | 5.00% |
| Math | A >= | Grade 4 | x13 | 60.00% | 60.50% | 61.00% | 61.50% |
| Math | B >= | Grade 8 | 44.44% | 45.00% | 45.50% | 46.00% | 46.50% |
| Math | C >= | Grade HS | x13 | 2.00% | 2.00% | 2.00% | 4.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**   
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its Cluster Stakeholders group members specifically for Indicators 3, 5, and 17 in order to review and recommend targets that demonstrate improvements for this indicator over the 5-year targets of this SPP/APR. As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies. The State Cluster Stakeholders used the data collected and reported for this indicator to build a framework for building capacity within the State Curriculum and Instructions Literacy Improvement Plan and the VIDE School-Wide Strategic Improvement Plan designed to improve literacy outcomes for ELA and increase the proficiency rates in reading comprehension for children with disabilities in grades 3 as specified in the State Improvement Measurable Results. The Cluster Stakeholders reviewed the baseline data collected and reported for this indicator and made recommendations on the targets for improvement over the next 5 years of data collection for Reading and Math in grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11. The Stakeholders verified the data collected and reported for this indicator and agreed to only use the baseline data reported to revise and propose new target data over the next 5 years that will represent an improvement over the baseline data for Reading and Math in grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11. Furthermore, the Stakeholders agreed to remove the targets presented during this APR submission and made clarification as required by OSEP Response. The Stakeholders agreed that the data entered as (0) is valid and reliable data for Reading grades 8, and grades 11, and for Math grades 11. Moreover, the Stakeholders agreed and proposed new target data for these measurements that will demonstrate improvement over the baseline data. The Stakeholders agreed that data for FFY 2020 SPP/APR were not available to report on the FFY 2021 SPP/APR as the VIDE requested a waiver as required under section 8401(b) of the ESEA, as amended. The Assessments administered by the VIDE during the FFY 2020 SPP/APR were only administered for informational purposes. Thus, this resulted in the VIDE/SOSE's inability to have baseline and target data for this indicator on the gap in proficiency rate (grade-level academic achievement standards).   
  
  
The VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improvement targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 3, 5, and 17 (SSIP). The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator were reintroduced to the methodology and measurements which closely looks at the overall proficiency of children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | x[[10]](#footnote-11) | 9 | x14 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | x14 | x14 | x14 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency level was assigned for the alternate assessment | x14 | 9 | x14 |
| b. Children with IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient | x14 | 4 | x14 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x[[11]](#footnote-12) | x15 |  | x15 | x15 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x15 | 9 |  | x15 | x15 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x15 | x15 |  | x15 | x15 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Number of Children with IEPs Scoring At or Above Proficient Against Alternate Academic Achievement Standards** | **Number of Children with IEPs who Received a Valid Score and for whom a Proficiency Level was Assigned for the Alternate Assessment** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x15 | x15 |  | x15 | x15 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | 4 | 9 |  | 44.44% | 44.44% | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x15 | x15 |  | x15 | x15 | N/A | N/A |

**Regulatory Information**

**The SEA, (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, LEA) must make available to the public, and report to the public with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessment of nondisabled children: (1) the number of children with disabilities participating in: (a) regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations in order to participate in those assessments; and (b) alternate assessments aligned with alternate achievement standards; and (2) the performance of children with disabilities on regular assessments and on alternate assessments, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, on those assessments. [20 U.S.C. 1412 (a)(16)(D); 34 CFR §300.160(f)]**

**Public Reporting Information**

**Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.**

https://vide.vi/blog/1949-school-report-card.html  
  
Instructions:   
Click on or paste the link provided above  
You will arrive at the School Report Card page  
Scroll to the bottom of the page and click on Transitional Report Card (School Year 2014-15 to 2021-2022)  
You will then arrive at the page that says Public Reports, scroll down until you see the heading Transitional Report Card

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3C - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3C - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
The Virgin Islands revised its targets for this indicator for FFY 2021 through FFY 2025, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3C - Required Actions

# Indicator 3D: Gap in Proficiency Rates (Grade Level Academic Achievement Standards)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator**: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:

A. Participation rate for children with IEPs.

B. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level academic achievement standards.

C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against alternate academic achievement standards.

D. Gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and all students against grade level academic achievement standards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

3D. Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using EDFacts file specifications FS175 and 178.

**Measurement**

D. Proficiency rate gap = [(proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year) subtracted from the (proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year)]. Calculate separately for reading and math. Calculate separately for grades 4, 8, and high school. The proficiency rate includes all children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

**Instructions**

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Include information regarding where to find public reports of assessment participation and performance results, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f), *i.e.*, a link to the Web site where these data are reported.

Indicator 3D: Gap calculations in this SPP/APR must result in the proficiency rate for children with IEPs were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year compared to the proficiency rate for all students who were proficient against grade level academic achievement standards for the 2021-2022 school year. Calculate separately for reading/language arts and math in each of the following grades: 4, 8, and high school, including both children enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year. Only include children with disabilities who had an IEP at the time of testing.

## 3D - Indicator Data

**Historical Data:**

| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reading | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 10.72 |
| Reading | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 15.18 |
| Reading | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 27.58 |
| Math | A | Grade 4 | 2021 | 5.36 |
| Math | B | Grade 8 | 2021 | 6.08 |
| Math | C | Grade HS | 2021 | 4.69 |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Subject** | **Group** | **Group Name** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Reading | A <= | Grade 4 | 10.72 | 10.50 | 10.50 | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| Reading | B <= | Grade 8 | 15.18 | 15.00 | 15.00 | 14.50 | 14.50 |
| Reading | C <= | Grade HS | 27.58 | 27.50 | 27.50 | 27.00 | 26.00 |
| Math | A <= | Grade 4 | 5.36 | 5.10 | 5.10 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| Math | B <= | Grade 8 | 6.08 | 5.90 | 5.90 | 5.50 | 5.50 |
| Math | C <= | Grade HS | 4.69 | 4.50 | 4.50 | 4.30 | 4.10 |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its Cluster Stakeholders group members specifically for Indicators 3, 5, and 17 in order to review and recommend targets that demonstrate improvements for this indicator over the 5-year targets of this SPP/APR. As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies. The State Cluster Stakeholders used the data collected and reported for this indicator to build a framework for building capacity within the State Curriculum and Instructions Literacy Improvement Plan and the VIDE School-Wide Strategic Improvement Plan designed to improve literacy outcomes for ELA and increase the proficiency rates in reading comprehension for children with disabilities in grades 3 as specified in the State Improvement Measurable Results. The Cluster Stakeholders reviewed the baseline data collected and reported for this indicator and made recommendations on the targets for improvement over the next 5 years of data collection for Reading and Math in grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11. The Stakeholders verified the data collected and reported for this indicator and agreed to only use the baseline data reported to revise and propose new target data over the next 5 years that will represent an improvement over the baseline data for Reading and Math in grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11. Furthermore, the Stakeholders agreed to remove the targets presented during this APR submission and made clarification as required by OSEP Response. The Stakeholders agreed that the data entered as (0) is valid and reliable data for Math grades 4, grades 8, and grades 11. Moreover, the Stakeholders agreed and proposed new target data for these measurements that will demonstrate improvement over the baseline data. The Stakeholders agreed that data for FFY 2020 SPP/APR were not available to report on the FFY 2021 SPP/APR as the VIDE requested a waiver as required under section 8401(b) of the ESEA, as amended. The Assessments administered by the VIDE during the FFY 2020 SPP/APR were only administered for informational purposes. Thus, this resulted in the VIDE/SOSE's inability to have baseline and target data for this indicator on the gap in proficiency rate (grade-level academic achievement standards).   
  
  
The VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improvement targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 3, 5, and 17 (SSIP). The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator were reintroduced to the methodology and measurements which closely looks at the overall gap in proficiency rates for children with IEPs and for all students against grade-level academic achievement standards.

**FFY 2021 Data Disaggregation from EDFacts**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec FS178; Data Group: 584)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Reading Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 725 | 686 | 572 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 42 | 53 | 56 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x[[12]](#footnote-13) | x16 | x16 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x16 | x16 | x16 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x16 | x16 | x16 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x16 | x16 | x16 |

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec FS175; Data Group: 583)

**Date:**

04/05/2023

**Math Assessment Proficiency Data by Grade**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group** | **Grade 4** | **Grade 8** | **Grade HS** |
| a. All Students who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 728 | 691 | 576 |
| b. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned for the regular assessment | 42 | 55 | 55 |
| c. All students in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x16 | x16 | x16 |
| d. All students in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x[[13]](#footnote-14) | x17 | x17 |
| e. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x17 | x17 | x17 |
| f. Children with IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level | x17 | x17 | x17 |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x17 | x17 |  | 10.72 | 10.72 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x17 | x17 |  | 15.18 | 15.18 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x17 | x17 |  | 27.58 | 27.58 | N/A | N/A |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment**

| **Group** | **Group Name** | **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **Proficiency rate for all students scoring at or above proficient against grade level academic achievement standards** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | Grade 4 | x17 | x17 |  | 5.36 | 5.36 | N/A | N/A |
| **B** | Grade 8 | x17 | x17 |  | 6.08 | 6.08 | N/A | N/A |
| **C** | Grade HS | x17 | x17 |  | 4.69 | 4.69 | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

## 3D - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Virgin Islands must also provide baseline data and targets for FFY 2021-2025, as required by the Measurement Table.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

## 3D - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2021, and OSEP accepts that revision.  
  
The Virgin Islands revised its FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

## 3D - Required Actions

# Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions for more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable))] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2021-2022 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4A: Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation (based upon districts that met the minimum n and/or cell size requirement, if applicable). If significant discrepancies occurred, describe how the State educational agency reviewed and, if appropriate, revised (or required the affected local educational agency to revise) its policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, to ensure that such policies, procedures, and practices comply with applicable requirements.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 4A - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2010 | 50.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target <= | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target <= | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improving/meeting targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 4A, 4B, 9, and 10. The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator were reintroduced to the methodology, measurements and historical data on the rates of suspension/expulsion/significant discrepancy, As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians, special education and related services providers, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members. Stakeholders for this specific cluster were introduced to disaggregated data by race, and ethnicity to determine if any discrepancies are occurring in the rates of long-term suspension and or expulsions of children with IEPs; moreover this cluster were introduced to data by child count used by the State to determine if any disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific disability categories as well as any districts identification of race and ethnic groups is the results of inappropriate identification.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

NO

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy** | **Number of LEAs in the State** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 2 | 0.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a))**

The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The VIDE/SOSE defines significant discrepancy by using a rate ratio methodology that compares the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each district (LEA) to the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children without IEPs in that same district. A significant discrepancy exists when the rate ratio is 2.0 or greater for any district. The VIDE/SOSE does not use a minimum "n" size and includes all students with disabilities in all grades within each of the two districts.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The count of students with disabilities data are used for this specific indicator and is obtained from the December 1, 2020 618 Child Count Data for Children with Disabilities. The Districts also report discipline data to the VIDE using the Territory's Student Information System, Power School. The Territory's Student Information System is managed by the VIDE Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation (PRE) and includes a variety of edit checks to ensure accuracy of submitted data. All ethnic groups of students (African Americans/Blacks; Hispanic/Latinos; Whites; Two or More Races (Multi-Race); Pacific Islanders; Native Americans; Asians) are included in the discipline data count of students who are suspended and/or expelled for greater than 10 days in the school year (2020-2021). The VIDE/SOSE compares its suspension removals of greater than 10 days of Special Education students to the rate students without disabilities are suspended. No ethnic groups are excluded from the calculations of students suspended or expelled during the school year 2020-2021. The State verifies the reliability and accuracy of the State's lag Year data through automated verification checks through its database.  
  
Discipline data from this system are utilized to satisfy 618 data collection which is reported via EdFacts Reporting System by Disability Category (OSEP030) and captured on the Report of Children with Disabilities (IDEA) Unilaterally Removed or Suspended/Expelled for More than 10 Days) for the School Year 2020-2021. As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the State conducted a virtual desk audit for FFY 2021 of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the School Year of 2020-2021.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

The discipline data report used for this indicator is taken from the EDFacts FS006 data submission “Child with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions”. This submission captures the cumulative length of removals of students with disabilities and reports a count of students by race/ethnicity who were subject to suspensions/expulsions greater than 10 days. It reports a separate count of students with removals greater than 10 days based on whether the removal was out-of-school (used for this indicator) or in-school.  
  
As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the VIDE/SOSE conducted a virtual desk audit of all students suspended for greater than 10 days in school year 2020-2021 in preparation for the February 1, 2023 APR submission. The discipline data for the reported school year 2020-2021 reported that no student was suspended for greater than 10 days in the reported school year 2020-2021 for neither District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) nor District 2 (St. Croix). Thus, the VIDE/SOSE did not identify nor issue and findings of noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR Section 300.170(b).   
  
As best practice, and to ensure that the Districts continue to be compliant with the IDEA regulations and implement policies, practices and procedures in conformity therewith, the VIDE/SOSE conducted a technical assistance training on Manifestation Determination for the newly hired Dean of Students assigned to the junior high and high school level. At that October 2022 Dean of Student Policy Training, participants received the VIDE/SOSE’s Suspension and Expulsion Administrator’s Checklist that was implemented by the State during school year 2012-2013, as well as the IDEA Regulations on Suspension and Expulsion.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4A - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4A - OSEP Response

## 4A - Required Actions

# Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Compliance Indicator:** Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. Percent of local educational agencies (LEA) that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and

B. Percent of LEAs that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

**Data Source**

State discipline data, including State’s analysis of State’s Discipline data collected under IDEA Section 618, where applicable. Discrepancy can be computed by either comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to rates for nondisabled children within the LEA or by comparing the rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of LEAs that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of more than 10 days during the school year of children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “significant discrepancy.”

**Instructions**

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of LEAs totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement.

Describe the results of the State’s examination of the data for the year before the reporting year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, use data from 2020-2021), including data disaggregated by race and ethnicity to determine if significant discrepancies, as defined by the State, are occurring in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) of children with IEPs, as required at 20 U.S.C. 1412(a)(22). The State’s examination must include one of the following comparisons:

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs among LEAs within the State; or

--The rates of suspensions and expulsions for children with IEPs to nondisabled children within the LEAs

In the description, specify which method the State used to determine possible discrepancies and explain what constitutes those discrepancies.

Because the measurement table requires that the data examined for this indicator are lag year data, States should examine the 618 data that was submitted by LEAs that were in operation during the school year before the reporting year. For example, if a State has 100 LEAs operating in the 2020-2021 school year, those 100 LEAs would have reported 618 data in 2020-2021 on the number of children suspended/expelled. If the State then opens 15 new LEAs in 2021-2022, suspension/expulsion data from those 15 new LEAs would not be in the 2020-2021 618 data set, and therefore, those 15 new LEAs should not be included in the denominator of the calculation. States must use the number of LEAs from the year before the reporting year in its calculation for this indicator. For the FFY 2021 SPP/APR submission, States must use the number of LEAs reported in 2020-2021 (which can be found in the FFY 2020 SPP/APR introduction).

Indicator 4B: Provide the following: (a) the number of LEAs that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups that have a significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, by race or ethnicity, in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions (more than 10 days during the school year) for children with IEPs; and (b) the number of those LEAs in which policies, procedures or practices contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If discrepancies occurred and the LEA with discrepancies had policies, procedures or practices that contributed to the significant discrepancy, as defined by the State, and that do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards, describe how the State ensured that such policies, procedures, and practices were revised to comply with applicable requirements consistent with (OSEP) Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

Targets must be 0% for 4B.

## 4B - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2010 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n/cell-size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, LEAs that met the State-established n/cell size. Report the number of LEAs excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of LEAs that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity** | **Number of those LEAs that have policies, procedure or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements** | **Number of LEAs that met the State's minimum n/cell size** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**State’s definition of “significant discrepancy” and methodology**

The VIDE/SOSE defines significant discrepancy by using a rate ratio methodology that compares the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with disabilities by race and ethnicity in each LEA to the rates of suspensions and expulsions for all children without disabilities, within the same LEA.  
  
A district is deemed to be significantly discrepant when (1) the ratio of the district's suspension/expulsion rates for children with disabilities from any racial or ethnic group is at a rate of 2.0 higher than the suspension rate for all children without disabilities (IEPs), in that same district; and (2) it policies, procedures or practices contributes to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral intervention and supports, and procedural safeguards.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

DATA SOURCES  
  
The Discipline Data used for this indicator are taken from the EDFacts FS006 data submission “Child with Disabilities (IDEA) Suspensions/Expulsions” submission which captures the data for the overall student population in the rate of suspension/expulsion of students with IEPs in six racial/ethnic groups. The percentage of students with IEPs suspended for greater than 10 days in the school year (2020-2021) are then compared to the overall student population for suspension/expulsion in that same district. This reporting captures a separate count of students with removals greater than 10 days based on whether the removal was out-of-school (data used for this indicator) or in-school suspension. The Territory's Student Information System is managed by the VIDE Office of Planning, Research & Evaluation (PRE) and includes a variety of edit checks to ensure accuracy of submitted data. The State verifies the reliability and accuracy of the State's data through automated verification checks through its databases.

**Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2021 using 2020-2021 data)**

**Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

As part of its general supervisory responsibilities, the State conducted a desk audit of students suspended for greater than 10 days in the School Year of 2020-2021. The discipline data which is used in determining significant discrepancy for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR due February 1, 2023, revealed that neither District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) nor District 2 (St. Croix) had students suspended/expelled for greater than 10 days. Thus, the State did not identify nor issue any findings of non-compliance with Part B requirements for this specific indicator.   
  
Accordingly, and to ensure that the Districts continue to be compliant with the IDEA regulations and implement policies, practices and procedures in conformity therewith, the VIDE/SOSE conducted a technical assistance training on Manifestation Determination for the newly hired Dean of Students assigned to the Territory’s junior high and high school level. At that October 2022 Dean of Student Policy Training, the VIDE/SOSE’s Suspension and Expulsion Administrator’s Checklist that was implemented by the State during school year 2012-2013, and the IDEA Regulations on Suspension and Expulsion were distributed to the attendees, which also included school administrators.

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 4B - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 4B - OSEP Response

## 4B- Required Actions

# Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 5 (Kindergarten) - 21)

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served:

A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;

B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and

C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS002.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class 80% or more of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served inside the regular class less than 40% of the day) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children with IEPs aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements) divided by the (total # of students aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 with IEPs)]times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs are included in Indicator 6.Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA, explain.

## 5 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2019 | Target >= | 53.00% | 54.00% | 56.00% | 58.44% | 58.89% |
| A | 58.44% | Data | 56.44% | 57.30% | 57.60% | 58.44% | 58.89% |
| B | 2019 | Target <= | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 21.37% | 20.30% |
| B | 21.37% | Data | 18.19% | 19.61% | 22.38% | 21.37% | 20.30% |
| C | 2019 | Target <= | 3.05% | 3.05% | 2.95% | 2.44% | 2.63% |
| C | 2.44% | Data | 3.64% | 3.98% | 2.87% | 2.44% | 2.63% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 58.89% | 58.89% | 59.00% | 59.00% | 59.00% |
| Target B <= | 20.30% | 20.30% | 20.00% | 20.00% | 20.00% |
| Target C <= | 2.63% | 2.63% | 2.60% | 2.60% | 2.40% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improvement targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 3, 5, and 17 (SSIP). The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator were reintroduced to the methodology and measurements which closely looks at the overall participation rate of children with IEPs. As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of l children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool,), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies.

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 | 946 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 525 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 199 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in separate schools | 15 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in residential facilities | 7 |
| SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS002; Data group 74) | 07/06/2022 | c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 in homebound/hospital placements | 3 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Education Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day | 525 | 946 | 58.89% | 58.89% | 55.50% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day | 199 | 946 | 20.30% | 20.30% | 21.04% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Number of children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3] | 25 | 946 | 2.63% | 2.63% | 2.64% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A** | The VIDE/SOSE can attribute this slippage to not meeting the target for Measurement A for FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22). Furthermore, the reason for slippage can also be attributed to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams’ members agreeing that the academic and functional needs of these children were unable to be met in Measurement A of this indicator. As such, services in Measurement B and C of this specific Indicator was the most suitable setting, which captures the number of school-aged children with IEPs aged five (5) to include five (5) year olds in kindergarten through 21 were in the regular class for more than 80% of the school day. |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Measurement A: During FFY 2021, (December 1, 2021, Child Count) five hundred and twenty-five (525) or (55.49%) out of nine hundred and forty-six children of children with IEPs aged children with IEPs aged five (5) to include five (5) year olds in kindergarten through 21 were in the regular class for more than 80% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target for FFY 2021 of 58.89% by 3.39%. Thus resulting in slippage for Measurement A of this Indicator.   
  
Measurement B: During FFY 2021, (December 1, 2021, Child Count) one hundred and ninety-nine (21.03%) out of nine hundred and forty-six (946) of children with IEPs aged five (5) to include five (5) year olds in kindergarten through twenty-one (21) were in the regular class less than 40% of the school day. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet the target for FFY 2021 of 20.30% and 20% by 0.74. Thus as per OSEP’s guidelines, there is no slippage for Measurement B of this Indicator.   
  
Measurement C: During FFY 2021, (December 1, 2021, Child Count) twenty-five (25) or (2.64%) out of nine hundred and forty-six (946) children with IEPs aged five (5) to include five (5) year olds in kindergarten through twenty-one (21) were in separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements. The VIDE/SOSE met the target for FFY 2021 of 2.63%. Thus as per OSEP’s guidelines, there is no slippage for Measurement C of this Indicator.   
The VIDE/SOSE did not meet its target for FFY 2021, (December 1, 2021, Child Count Data) the number of school-aged children with IEPs aged 5 (kindergarten) through twenty-one (21) for Measurement B and C. the VIDE/SOSE data for FFY 2021, is lower when compared to the data for FFY2018 and 2019 for measurement B of this Indicator. Likewise, for Measurement C the VIDE/SOSE data for FFY 2021 is lower when compared to the data reported for FF2016 through 2018.

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 5 - OSEP Response

## 5 - Required Actions

# Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of children with IEPs aged 3, 4, and aged 5 who are enrolled in a preschool program attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and

B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

C. Receiving special education and related services in the home.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

Same data as used for reporting to the Department under section 618 of the IDEA, using the definitions in EDFacts file specification FS089.

**Measurement**

A. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs attending a separate special education class, separate school or residential facility) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs receiving special education and related services in the home) divided by the (total # of children ages 3, 4, and 5 with IEPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling from the State’s 618 data is not allowed.*

States must report five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in preschool programs in this indicator. Five-year-old children with disabilities who are enrolled in kindergarten are included in Indicator 5.

States may choose to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age.

For Indicator 6C: States are not required to establish a baseline or targets if the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home is less than 10, regardless of whether the State chooses to set one target that is inclusive of children ages 3, 4, and 5, or set individual targets for each age. In a reporting period during which the number of children receiving special education and related services in the home reaches 10 or greater, States are required to develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

For Indicator 6C: States may express their targets in a range (*e.g.*, 75-85%).Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under IDEA section 618, explain.

## 6 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| **A** | Target >= | 94.00% | 94.00% | 94.50% | 97.44% | 97.44% |
| **A** | Data | 91.67% | 91.27% | 81.11% | 97.44% | 98.72% |
| **B** | Target <= | 4.50% | 4.25% | 1.19% | 1.28% | 1.28% |
| **B** | Data | 5.00% | 7.14% | 12.22% | 1.28% | 0.00% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continue to gather comprehensive stakeholder input on the performance and targets of the reconfigured Indicators into, Indicator Clusters (6 and 7) stakeholder group members, to ensure that there is a repetitiveness across all indicators which includes and is not limited to parents/guardian of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool,), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies.

**Targets**

**Please select if the State wants to set baseline and targets based on individual age ranges (i.e. separate baseline and targets for each age), or inclusive of all children ages 3, 4, and 5.**

Inclusive Targets

**Please select if the State wants to use target ranges for 6C.**

Target Range not used

Baselines for Inclusive Targets option (A, B, C)

| **Part** | **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | 2020 | 97.44% |
| **B** | 2020 | 1.28% |
| **C** | 2020 | 1.28% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6A, 6B**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 97.44% | 97.44% | 97.44% | 97.50% | 97.50% |
| Target B <= | 1.28% | 1.28% | 1.25% | 1.25% | 1.25% |

**Inclusive Targets – 6C**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target C <= | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Prepopulated Data**

**Data Source:**

SY 2021-22 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec FS089; Data group 613)

**Date:**

07/06/2022

| **Description** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **3 through 5 - Total** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total number of children with IEPs | 31 | 35 | 1 | 67 |
| a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 20 | 30 | 1 | 51 |
| b1. Number of children attending separate special education class | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b2. Number of children attending separate school | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| b3. Number of children attending residential facility | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| c1**.** Numberof children receiving special education and related services in the home | 11 | 4 | 0 | 15 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data - Aged 3 through 5**

| **Preschool Environments** | **Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served** | **Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program | 51 | 67 | 98.72% | 97.44% | 76.12% | Did not meet target | Slippage |
| B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility | 0 | 67 | 0.00% | 1.28% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C. Home | 15 | 67 | 1.28% | 0.00% | 22.39% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group A aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

The VIDE/SOSE can attribute the slippage for Measurement A of this Indicator to not meeting the target for FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22). Furthermore, the reason for slippage can also be attributed to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams’ members agreeing that the academic and functional needs of these children were unable to be met in Measurements A of this indicator. As such, services in Measurement B of this specific Indicator was the most suitable setting, which captures the number three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged 5 who are in kindergarten) who were in a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. Further, due to the lingering effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic a large number of parents and guardians of preschool children elected to have services provided in the home environment for FFY 2021 ( 2021/22).

**Provide reasons for slippage for Group C aged 3 through 5, if applicable**

The VIDE/SOSE can attribute this slippage to not meeting the target for Measurements A and C of the Indicator for FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22). Furthermore, the reason for slippage can also be attributed to the Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams’ members agreeing that the academic and functional needs of these children were unable to be met in Measurements A of this indicator. As such, services in Measurement C of this specific indicator were the most suitable setting. Further, due to the lingering effects of the COVID-19 Pandemic a large number of parents and guardians of preschool children elected to have services provided in the home environment for FFY 2021 (2021/22). The VIDE/SOSE will continue to work closely with District Offices of Special Education to ensure the utilization of the most effective strategies to enhance the performance of this Indicator; namely, measurement 6A.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Measurement A: During FFY 2021, (School Year 2021/22) fifty-one (51) out of sixty-seven (67) or (76.12%) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged 5 who are in kindergarten) were in a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet and exceed the target for FFY 2021 of 97.44% by 21.32% for Measurement 6A of this Indicator. Thus resulting in slippage for Measurement A of this Indicator.   
  
Measurement B: During FFY 2021, zero (0) out of sixty-seven (67) or (0%) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged 5 who are in kindergarten) were in a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in a separate special education class. The VIDE/SOSE met and exceeded the target for FFY 2021 of 1.28% for Measurement 6B of this Indicator.  
   
Measurement C: During FF 2021, eleven (15) out of sixty-seven (67) or (22.39%) of children with IEPs aged three (3) through five (5) (excluding children aged 5 who are in kindergarten) were receiving special education and related services in the home. The VIDE/SOSE did not meet and exceed the target for FFY 2021 of 97.44% by 21.11% for Measurement 6C of this Indicator.   
  
For the FFY 2021 (School Year 2021-22) VIDE/SOSE had more than ten (10) children receiving special education and related services in the home, as such is establishing a baseline for Measurement C for this Indicator.

## 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 6 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that for sub-indicator 6C, the Virgin Islands reported 15 children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 served while in its narrative the Virgin Islands reported that "eleven" children were served. Additionally, the Virgin Islands reported, "The VIDE/SOSE did not meet and exceed the target for FFY 2021 of 97.44% by 21.11% for Measurement 6C of this Indicator." OSEP notes the target for Measurement 6C of this Indicator is 0%.

## 6 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must ensure the data reported in the data table are consistent with its narrative for this indicator.

# Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Outcomes:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy); and

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

a. Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschool children who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

d. Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

e. Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschool children with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:**

**Summary Statement 1**: Of those preschool children who entered the preschool program below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:** Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in category (d)) divided by (# of preschool children reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2**: Percent = [(# of preschool children reported in progress category (d) plus # of preschool children reported in progress category (e)) divided by (the total # of preschool children reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling of **children for assessment** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement include, in the numerator and denominator, only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements. States have provided targets for the two Summary Statements for the three Outcomes (six numbers for targets for each FFY).

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers.” If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS), then the criteria for defining “comparable to same-aged peers” has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

## 7 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Part** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A1 | 2008 | Target >= | 68.00% | 69.00% | 70.00% | 71.00% | 40.00% |
| A1 | 9.90% | Data | 76.92% | 94.44% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 40.00% |
| A2 | 2008 | Target >= | 41.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 42.50% | 62.50% |
| A2 | 12.00% | Data | 54.78% | 60.00% | 77.78% | 77.78% | 62.50% |
| B1 | 2008 | Target >= | 68.50% | 68.50% | 69.00% | 69.00% | 40.00% |
| B1 | 14.10% | Data | 73.68% | 75.00% | 95.24% | 95.24% | 40.00% |
| B2 | 2008 | Target >= | 33.00% | 33.00% | 33.50% | 33.50% | 57.14% |
| B2 | 16.00% | Data | 50.43% | 56.67% | 64.44% | 66.67% | 57.14% |
| C1 | 2008 | Target >= | 79.00% | 79.00% | 79.50% | 79.50% | 65.22% |
| C1 | 11.30% | Data | 69.49% | 72.22% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 65.22% |
| C2 | 2008 | Target >= | 40.50% | 41.00% | 42.00% | 42.00% | 56.25% |
| C2 | 13.00% | Data | 48.70% | 60.00% | 75.56% | 77.78% | 56.25% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A1 >= | 40.00% | 40.50% | 40.50% | 40.50% | 41.00% |
| Target A2 >= | 62.50% | 62.50% | 63.00% | 63.00% | 63.50% |
| Target B1 >= | 40.00% | 40.00% | 40.50% | 40.50% | 41.00% |
| Target B2 >= | 57.14% | 57.14% | 57.50% | 57.50% | 58.00% |
| Target C1 >= | 65.20% | 65.20% | 65.20% | 65.50% | 65.50% |
| Target C2 >= | 56.30% | 56.30% | 56.30% | 56.50% | 56.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continue to gather comprehensive stakeholder input on the performance and targets of the reconfigured Indicators into, Indicator Clusters (6 and 7) stakeholder group members, to ensure that there is a repetitiveness across all indicators which includes and is not limited to parents/guardian of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool,), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed**

45

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

| **Outcome A Progress Category** | **Number of children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 1 | 2.22% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 6 | 13.33% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 14 | 31.11% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 23 | 51.11% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 2.22% |

| **Outcome A** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 37 | 44 | 40.00% | 40.00% | 84.09% | Met target | No Slippage |
| A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 24 | 45 | 62.50% | 62.50% | 53.33% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

| **Outcome B Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 2 | 5.00% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 6 | 15.00% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 14 | 35.00% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 17 | 42.50% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 1 | 2.50% |

| **Outcome B** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 31 | 39 | 40.00% | 40.00% | 79.49% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 18 | 40 | 57.14% | 57.14% | 45.00% | Did not meet target | Slippage |

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

| **Outcome C Progress Category** | **Number of Children** | **Percentage of Children** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning | 3 | 6.67% |
| b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers | 4 | 8.89% |
| c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it | 10 | 22.22% |
| d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers | 20 | 44.44% |
| e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers | 8 | 17.78% |

| **Outcome C** | **Numerator** | **Denominator** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation:(c+d)/(a+b+c+d)* | 30 | 37 | 65.22% | 65.20% | 81.08% | Met target | No Slippage |
| C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.  *Calculation: (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)* | 28 | 45 | 56.25% | 56.30% | 62.22% | Met target | No Slippage |

| **Part** | **Reasons for slippage, if applicable** |
| --- | --- |
| **A2** | The VIDE/SOSE can attribute this slippage to not meeting the target for Measurement Summary Statements A2 and B2 for FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) and the switch back to in-personal learning versus that of home/virtual instruction. |
| **B2** | The VIDE/SOSE can attribute this slippage to not meeting the target for Measurement Summary B2 for FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22)nd the switch back to in-personal learning versus that of home/virtual instruction. |

**Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? (yes/no)**

YES

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

In previous years, the Virgin Islands Department of Human Services, Head Start Program (VIDOHHSP) utilized the Child Observation Records (“COR”) and online collection data system to obtain the performance (entrance and exit) for all preschool children with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) enrolled in Head Start Preschool Programs. The COR utilized a zero (0)-five (5) -point scale for scoring; however, in the school year 2020-21, the VIDOHHSP switched to the COR advantage which utilizes a zero (0) to seven (7) point level scoring range. As such the VIDE/SOSE for FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) will continue to report data from the COR Advantage online system. Preschool Personnel extracts entry and exit data from the online system for each preschool child attending the Head Start Program receives special education and related services, once the extraction is complete the disaggregated data is forwarded to the VIDE/SOSE for data analysis and tabulation and tabulation and analyze the data for this indicator. In addition, the VIDOHHSP noted that children who participate in Early Head Start programs are expected to enter Preschool programs at Level Three (3). Moreover, the VIDOHHS Preschool programs noted that children exiting Head Start Programs and considered to be ready for Kindergarten ready should be at a Level five (5) or six (6). Listed below are the levels and the accompanying age of functioning for each of the levels.   
  
  
Level Functioning age level   
  
Zero (0) Infant   
One (1) One-year-old  
Two (2) Two-year-old   
Three (3) Three-year-old  
Four (4) Four-year-old  
Five (5) Five-year-old  
Six (6) Six-year-old   
Seven (7) Seven-year-old

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The Virgin Islands attribute the reason for slippage for Outcomes A, Summary Statement 2, and Outcome B Summary Statement 2 to the in-personal learning versus the home/virtual instruction.   
Additionally, five (5) children did not meet the 60% threshold. Although this is the case the Virgin Islands did capture data for all forty-five children.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE defines “comparable to same-age peers” as the approximate capabilities of children of a given age, across a variety of settings and situations, by however those capabilities can be demonstrated. Functioning comparable to same-age level peers is not to be determined by only a single score on a norm-referenced test or any other single assessment, although such scores when used in conjunction with other sources of information could inform a decision on the child’s status with regard to an outcome or how much progress a child has made. This definition was adopted from the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO).  
  
For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continued to work closely with Early Childhood Technical Assistance (“ECTA Center”), SRI Education a Division of International Research Center, and the Virgin Islands Department of Human Services, Head Start Programs (VIDOHHSP), to fulfill the data collection and tabulation for this Indicator.

## 7 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 7 - OSEP Response

In reporting the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program, the Virgin Islands reported 45 as the denominator in outcome A, 40 as the denominator in outcome B, and 45 as the denominator in outcome C. Additionally, the Virgin Islands reported 45 preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs were assessed. The Virgin Islands explained the discrepancy.

## 7 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR submission, the Virgin Islands must explain any discrepancies between the FFY 2022 total number assessed and the FFY 2022 denominator in its calculation of the percent of preschoolers aged 3 through 5 who were functioning within age expectations in each outcome area by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

# Indicator 8: Parent involvement

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** FAPE in the LRE

**Results indicator:** Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities) divided by the (total # of respondent parents of children with disabilities)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of parents from whom response is requested****is allowed.* *When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

If the State is using a separate data collection methodology for preschool children, the State must provide separate baseline data, targets, and actual target data or discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool data collection methodologies in a manner that is valid and reliable.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed and the number of respondent parents. The survey response rate is automatically calculated using the submitted data.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate) and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

**Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023,** include in the State’s analysis the extent to which the demographics of the children for whom parents responded are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. States must consider race/ethnicity. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the children for whom parents responding are not representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services in the State, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to parents (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person through school personnel), and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 8 - Indicator Data

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children? | NO |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continue to gather comprehensive stakeholder input on the performance and targets of the reconfigured Indicators into, Indicator Clusters (8, 11, and 12) stakeholder group members, to ensure that there is a repetitiveness across all indicators which includes and is not limited to parents/guardian of children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, school counselors, special and regular education teachers(preschool, elementary, junior and senior high), grade-level and content area specialist and outside linking agencies.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2006 | 76.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= | 83.00% | 83.50% | 83.50% | 83.50% | 79.71% |
| Data | 85.44% | 84.68% | 84.66% | 90.10% | 79.71% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= | 77.00% | 77.50% | 78.00% | 78.00% | 78.50% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities** | **Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities** | | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 330 | | 419 | 79.71% | 77.00% | 78.76% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.**

For FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) The VIDE/SOSE continued to utilize one survey instrument to collect data for children ages three (3) –five (5) (five-year-olds not in kindergarten) and six (6) through twenty-one (21)-including) (five-year-olds in kindergarten). The VIDE/SOSE generates a contact listing utilizing the State Student Management System “Goalview” and EDPlan ), to ensure that the data is valid and reliable, for all parents/guardians of children receiving special education and related services that include each child’s age which is the determining factor to discern the specific related questions (e.g., a child that is three-years-old his/her parent will be asked those questions specifically for preschool and the same for school-aged children.

**The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.**

906

**Percentage of respondent parents**

46.25%

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate | 100.00% | 46.25% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

For FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) The VIDE/SOSE has not identified any specific group that has been underrepresented. The VIDE/SOSE has a response rate of 46.25% which represents the total number of parents/guardians of children with disabilities who responded to the survey. The VIDE/SOSE will work closely to increase the response rate. As such, the language is revised to “Although ECC attempts to contact every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and families who, (a) refuse to respond to the survey, (b) cannot be reached by telephone, (c) moved, (d) failed to update telephone numbers; and (e) do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey." Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will work closely with the District Offices of Special Education to UVI/ECC, and its Division of Public Relations to promote the collection of these data by using its public service campaigns.  
  
Additionally, the Virgin Islands activated the radio button to signify that the survey instrument is NOT  
NEW or REVISED.

**Describe the analysis** **of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of parents of children with disabilities.**

Background information   
  
  
The University of the Virgin Islands (UVI), Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC) has conducted the VIDE’s parent satisfaction survey since the beginning of the State Performance Plan (SPP).   
The VIDE procured services and entered into its ninth (9th) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the ECC to perform the FFY 2020, parental satisfaction survey. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE has maintained the services of the University of the Virgin Islands, Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC) for the quality and expertise demonstrated throughout the years. As such, the VIDE entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of the Virgin Islands, Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC) to conduct telephonic surveys for the collection analysis and generation and public reporting of the results of Indicator 8 “Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities”.   
  
Process/Procedures/Methods   
Each parent of a child, ages three (3) through five (5) and ages six (6) through twenty-one (21), is called and encouraged to respond to the survey. Although ECC attempts to contact every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and families who, (a) refuse to respond to the survey, (b) cannot be reached by telephone, (c) moved, (d) failed to update telephone numbers; and (e) do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey. For FFY 2018, as in the past, the parents who responded to the survey are representative of the racial, ethnic, and socioeconomic groups that make up the United States Virgin Islands.   
  
Composition   
Every parent/guardian of a preschool child, aged three (3) through five (5) and aged school-aged child aged six (6) through twenty-one (21) is contacted via telephonic contact and is encouraged to respond to the survey. In essence, for FFY 2021, as in previous Federal Fiscal reporting years, the parents surveyed and responded are representative of the demographic of children receiving special education and related services in the United States Virgin Islands.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.** **States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must also include at least one of the following demographics: age of the student, disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

For FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22), the VIDE/SOSE’s analysis revealed that the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children and youth receiving special education services in the United States Virgin Islands.

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. (yes/no)

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |

| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |
| If yes, provide a copy of the survey. |  |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

VIDE/SOSE clarification to OSEP response  
  
The VIDE/SOSE has a response rate of 46.25% which represents the total   
number of parents/guardians of children with disabilities who responded to the survey. The VIDE/SOSE will   
work closely to increase the response rate. As such, the language is revised to “Although ECC attempts to   
contact every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and   
families who, (a) refuse to respond to the survey, (b) cannot be reached by telephone, (c) moved, (d) failed   
to update telephone numbers; and (e) do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey."   
Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will work closely with the district offices of Special Education to UVI/ECC, and   
its public relations division to promote the collection of these data by using its public service campaigns.  
  
Additionally, the Virgin Islands activated the radio button to signify that the survey instrument is NOT  
NEW or REVISED.   
   
  
  
Background information   
  
The University of the Virgin Islands (UVI), Eastern Caribbean Center (ECC) has conducted the VIDE’s parent satisfaction survey since the beginning of the State Performance Plan (SPP). The VIDE procured services and entered into its ninth (9th) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the ECC to perform the FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22), parental satisfaction survey. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE has maintained the services of the University of the Virgin Islands, Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC) for the quality and expertise demonstrated throughout the years. As such, the VIDE entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University of the Virgin Islands, Eastern Caribbean Center (UVI/ECC) to conduct telephonic surveys for the collection analysis and generation and public reporting of the results of Indicator 8 “Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities”.   
  
Process/Procedures/Methods   
  
Each parent of a child, ages three (3) through five (5) and ages six (6) through twenty-one (21), is called and encouraged to respond to the survey. Although ECC contacts every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and families who, (a) refuse to respond to the survey, (b) cannot be reached by telephone, (c) moved, (d) failed to update telephone numbers; and (e) do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey. For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22), as in the receiving special education and related services in the United States Virgin Islands as in past FYYs, the parents who responded to the survey are representative of the demographic of children and youth racial, ethnic and socioeconomic groups that make up the United States Virgin Islands.   
  
The survey is conducted using strict standards that require the interviewer to make calls at varying times of the day, including calls during daytime hours, evening hours, weekends, and holidays. Each interviewer has a script, which is rehearsed several times during training, with each person at the training taking turns both conducting and responding to the survey. This is done to ensure that all survey takers are reading the script accurately and fluently. In addition, there are a prescribed number of attempts that must be made before the parent or guardian is considered a “non-responder.” No less than ten (10) attempts must be made on various days and at different times, before survey takers may consider a parent or guardian a “non-responder.” Telephone calls are made in this way to maximize the chances of reaching parents and guardians. This ensures all parents of children receiving special education and related services are contacted, which eliminates any chance of nonresponse biases.   
  
Each parent of a child, ages three (3) through five (5) and ages six (6) through twenty-one (21), is called and encouraged to respond to the survey. Although ECC contacts every parent/guardian in the Territory who has a child with a disability, there are parents and families who, (a) refuse to respond to the survey, (b) cannot be reached by telephone, (c) moved, (d) failed to update telephone numbers, and (e) do not complete the survey or are unable to complete the survey.   
  
For FFY 2021(School Year 2021-22) The VIDE/SOSE has not identified any specific group that has been underrepresented.

## 8 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not report the response rate or the metric used to determine representativeness. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Virgin Islands must report the information, as required by the Measurement Table.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

To meet the requirements and to address the required actions, the VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the data for FFY 2020. The stakeholders for this cluster were tasked with an analysis of the FFY 2020 data and identifying the response rate, representativeness of the demographic of responders, and metric used in the calculations of representativeness for responders as required by OSEP in its FFY 2020 required actions. The analysis of the FFY 2020 data determined that 100% of target responders responded to the survey. The Stakeholders further disaggregated the data to determine the rate of representativeness and this analysis looked at the aggregate numbers of children in each disability category, race/ethnicity, and gender of all children with disabilities. The analysis compared the rate of responders for each of the approved categories for representativeness. The category of respondents in the disability categories of Specific Learning Disability, Autism, Developmental Delayed, Intellectual Disability, Speech or Language Impairment, and Other Health Impairments were all analyzed for representativeness using a differentiated ratio of over/under-representation. All other disability categories with less than thirty (30) were extracted from the analysis. In the category of race/ethnicity, the analysis captured that the total percent of responders in the approved disability categories were in the Black/African American (not Hispanic). Further analysis showed that all the other ethnic categories as approved by stakeholders responded to the survey. The analysis for the gender of all responders in the approved disability categories all targeted responders responded to the survey. Based on the analysis of all the responders in the approved disability categories, race/ethnicity, and gender, the responders to the demographic of children for whom parents responded and are representative of the demographic of children receiving special education services in the United States Virgin Islands.

## 8 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands revised its targets for FFY 2021 through 2025 for this indicator. However, OSEP cannot accept those targets because the Virgin Islands did not describe its stakeholder input process for revising its targets, as required by the FFY 2021 Part B SPP/APR General Instructions.  
  
The Virgin Islands did not include a description of the demographic categories used in its analysis to determine whether the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.   
  
The Virgin Islands did not describe the metric used to determine representativeness, as required by the Measurement Table.

## 8 - Required Actions

The Virgin Islands did not provide targets. The Virgin Islands must provide the required targets through FFY 2025 in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, including a description of the stakeholder input process for revising its targets.  
  
In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must report the demographic categories used in its analysis to determine whether the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. In addition, the Virgin Islands must report the metric used to determine representativeness.

# Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and 6 through 21 served under IDEA, aggregated across all disability categories.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken. If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 9 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The VIDE/SOSE defines disproportionate representation using a relative difference in composition calculation, comparing children with disabilities in racial/ethnic groups to the population of children without disabilities in that same district. The population examined is for any student identified as eligible for special education in each race or ethnic group. Data of one school year (2021-2022) is aggregated in all racial/ethnic groups for all children aged 5 who are in kindergarten in addition to children aged 6 through 21 who are served under IDEA.  
  
DATA SOURCE  
  
The data sources for this Indicator is Public School Student enrollment data for All Students by Race and Ethnicity dated September 30, 2021 from PRE, and data collected under IDEA Section 618 – Child Count dated December 1, 2021 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as Amended 2004).   
  
The 618 Child Count data are collected via Goalview, the VIDE/SOSE Special Education Data Management System and reported to the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) via the EDFacts online electronic reporting system. Public School Student Enrollment data from the Division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) captured on September 30, 2021 and Special Education data captured on the December 1, 2021 Annual Child Count, were used in determining whether or not the two districts (District 1: St. Thomas/St. John) and (District 2: St. Croix) were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.   
  
Disproportionate Representation is present in any district where the relative difference in composition for any race or ethnic group in comparison to the total population of non-disabled students in that same district is 20% or more. The VIDE/SOSE uses a minimum “n “ of 10, which means that there must be at least 10 students in that specific racial and ethnic group.  
  
Methodology  
  
The methodology for determining disproportionate representation is 1) the percent of students by race who are enrolled in the district; 2) compare those percentages to the percent of students of each race or ethnicity that is identified for special education; and 3) indicate that if the identification of any race or ethnicity for special education is greater than 20% of that race or ethnic groups representation in the enrollment. If that race or ethnic group is greater than 20%, then that race is identified as having disproportionate representation.  
  
The Relative differences in racial/ethnic composition comparison:  
  
A= Number of children in disability category from a racial/ethnic group ÷ Total # of children in the district in that particular disability category x 100 = %  
B= Number of students from a racial/ethnic group enrolled in district ÷ Total number of all students enrolled in district x 100 = %.   
  
Disproportionate Representation (Overrepresentation) = Relative difference in composition exceeds 20%.   
  
Note: Calculations are completed for only those disability eligibility categories and racial/ethnic categories that meet the minimum “n” size of 10.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.**

Utilizing the Child Count data and the approved methodology, the State determined that District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) meets the minimum “n” of 10 children/students with disabilities receiving special education and related services for African American/Black students, White students and Hispanic/Latino students. The only racial/ethnic group with a relative difference that exceeded the 20% threshold were White children/students when compared with all non-disabled students enrolled in the St. Thomas/St. John district.  
  
For exceeding the 20% threshold for White children/students, District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) was required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis that addresses the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referral for Evaluation; Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards. Following receipt of the District’s analysis, the State reviewed the District’s responses to ensure that the District was compliant with IDEA policies, practices and procedures in each of the areas addressed. After careful review, the State concurred with the District’s assessment that the over representation of White children/students was not due to inappropriate identification nor noncompliance with IDEA policies, practices and procedures.  
  
District 2 (St. Croix). The State has determined that District 2 meets the minimum “n” of 10 children with disabilities receiving special education and related services in the following racial/ethnic categories; African American/Black, More than one Race (Multi-Race), Hispanic/Latino and White. The racial/ethnic groups with a relative difference that exceeded the 20% threshold were White students, and Two or More (Multi-Race). Based on the calculation for determining disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that may be the result of inappropriate identification, the St. Croix district was required to complete the Facilitated Self-Analysis (FSA) that addresses the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referral for Evaluation; Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards. Subsequently, the State reviewed the St. Croix District’s responses on the FSA and determined that the District is compliant with IDEA relative to policies, practices, and procedures in each of the areas addressed.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Based on the calculation for determining disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that may beg the result of inappropriate identification, both districts were required to complete the Facilitated Self Analysis (FSA) that addresses the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referral for Evaluation; Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards. Subsequently, the State reviewed the District’s’ responses to the FSA and determined that District 1 and District 2 are compliant with IDEA relative to policies, practices, and procedures in each of the areas addressed.  
  
In addition to the Facilitated Self Analysis, the VIDE/SOSE Compliance Unit conducted a desk audit of student files, using the Student Management System to verify that the files contained evidence that the disproportionate representation identified is not a result of inappropriate identification in the specific racial/ethnic categories.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data, as required due to a change in the Measurement Table. Virgin Islands must revise its baseline, using FFY 2020 data, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The VIDE/SOSE revised its baseline using the FFY 2020 data as required by OSEP.

## 9 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Island has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020 and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 9 - Required Actions

# Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** Disproportionality

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

**Data Source**

State’s analysis, based on State’s Child Count data collected under IDEA section 618, to determine if the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of districts, that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups, with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of districts in the State that meet the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups)] times 100.

Include State’s definition of “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

Based on its review of the 618 data for the reporting year, describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification as required by 34 CFR §§300.600(d)(3) and 300.602(a), e.g., using monitoring data; reviewing policies, practices and procedures, etc. In determining disproportionate representation, analyze data, for each district, for all racial and ethnic groups in the district, or all racial and ethnic groups in the district that meet a minimum n and/or cell size set by the State. Report on the percent of districts in which disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories is the result of inappropriate identification, even if the determination of inappropriate identification was made after the end of the FFY 2021 reporting period (i.e., after June 30, 2022).

**Instructions**

Provide racial/ethnic disproportionality data for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten and aged 6 through 21 served under IDEA. Provide these data at a minimum for children in the following six disability categories: intellectual disability, specific learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, speech or language impairments, other health impairments, and autism. If a State has identified disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories other than these six disability categories, the State must include these data and report on whether the State determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

States are not required to report on underrepresentation.

If the State has established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met that State-established n and/or cell size. If the State used a minimum n and/or cell size requirement, report the number of districts totally excluded from the calculation as a result of this requirement because the district did not meet the minimum n and/or cell size for any racial/ethnic group.

Consider using multiple methods in calculating disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups to reduce the risk of overlooking potential problems. Describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation.

Provide the number of districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size (if applicable) for one or more racial/ethnic groups identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories and the number of those districts identified with disproportionate representation that is the result of inappropriate identification.

Targets must be 0%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 10 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2020 | 0.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Data | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

**Has the state established a minimum n and/or cell size requirement? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, the State may only include, in both the numerator and the denominator, districts that met the State-established n and/or cell size. Report the number of districts excluded from the calculation as a result of the requirement.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories** | **Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial/ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification** | **Number of districts that met the State's minimum n and/or cell size** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| 1 | 0 | 2 | 0.00% | 0% | 0.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Were all races and ethnicities included in the review?**

YES

**Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).**

The VIDE/SOSE defines disproportionate representation using a relative difference in composition calculation, comparing children with disabilities in racial/ethnic groups to the population of children without disabilities in that same district. Data of one school year (school year 2021-2022) is aggregated across all disability categories in racial/ethnic groups for all children aged 5 who are enrolled in kindergarten in addition to children aged 6 through 21 who are served under IDEA. Disproportionate Representation is present in any district where the relative difference in composition for children with disabilities in any race or ethnic group in comparison to the total population of non-disabled students in that same district is 20% or more. The VIDE/SOSE uses a minimum "n" of 10. Calculations are completed only for those eligibilities and racial/ethnic categories that meet the minimum “n” size of 10. In other words, there must be at least 10 students in the specific disability category in the district in order for the relative difference in composition to be calculated.   
  
METHODOLOGY  
  
The VIDE/SOSE utilized one year of data (Public School Student Enrollment data for School Year 2021-2022) from PRE and data from the December 1, 2021 Child Count, together with the relative difference in composition calculation, to determine whether or not the districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification. A district is flagged as having disproportionate representation when it exceeds the 20% threshold in one of the six disabling categories when compared to other non-disabled children in that same ethnic group. Calculations are completed for those eligibilities and racial/ethnic categories that meet the minimum "n" size of 10. Therefore, no districts were excluded as a result of using a minimum "n" of 10.  
  
DATA SOURCE  
  
The data source for this indicator are the Public School Student Enrollment Data for All Students by Race and Ethnicity captured on September 30, 2021 and the December 1, 2021 Child Count data collected under IDEA Section 618 (Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, as Amended 200). The 618 Child Count data are collected via the VIDE/SOSE's Student Data Management System (Goalview) and reported to the United States Department of Education, Office of Special Education, via the EDFacts online electronic reporting system. The public school enrollment data from the Division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) captured on September 30, 2021, and the special education data captured on December 1, 2021, along with the approved methodology stated above, are used in determining whether or not the district was identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

**Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.**

District 1: Using the criteria stated above, District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) had the minimum "n" of ten (10) African American/Black student in three of the four (4) disability categories, however, it was found not to have an over representation in any racial/ethnic groups in a specific disability category. None of the racial and ethnic groups exceeded the 20% threshold of Over Representation in the disability categories.   
   
District 2 (St. Croix): Based on the calculation for determining disproportionate over representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories, District 2 was found to have over representation of Hispanic/Latino in the disability category of specific learning disabilities and over representation in the disability category of intellectual learning disabilities. The racial and ethnic group of Multi-Race (Two or More Races) had over representation in the disability category of autism.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

According to the State's Compliance Monitoring Procedures Manual, once a district is flagged as having exceeded the 20% relative threshold resulting in disproportionate over-representation, they are required to complete the Facilitated Self Analysis that addresses the following areas: Curriculum and Instruction/General Education Interventions; Child Find; Referral for Evaluation; Evaluation; Eligibility and Placement; and Procedural Safeguards. Following receipt of the District’s analysis, the State then reviews the District’s responses to ensure that the District was compliant with IDEA policies, practices, and procedures in each of the areas addressed.   
  
The VIDE/SOSE reviewed District 2's response to the FSA and concluded that the identified over-representation of both the Hispanic/Latino ethnic group in the disability category of special learning disabilities and over-representation in the disability category of intellectual learning disabilities was not due to inappropriate identification. Likewise, for the racial and ethnic group of Multi-Race (Two or More Races) in the disability category of autism, the over-representation was not due to inappropriate identification.  
  
The VIDE/SOSE Compliance Unit conducted a desk audit of student files using the Student Management System (Goalview) to verify that the files contained evidence that the disproportionate over-representation identified in the specific disability categories are not a result of inappropriate identification.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 10 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not revise its baseline using FFY 2020 data, as required due to a change in the Measurement Table. Virgin Islands must revise its baseline, using FFY 2020 data, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The VIDE/SOSE revised its baseline using the FFY 2020 data as required by OSEP.

## 10 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Island has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2020, and OSEP accepts that revision.

## 10 - Required Actions

# Indicator 11: Child Find

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Indicate if the State has established a timeline and, if so, what is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations.

**Measurement**

a. # of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received.

b. # of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline).

Account for children included in (a), but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Note that under 34 CFR §300.301(d), the timeframe set for initial evaluation does not apply to a public agency if: (1) the parent of a child repeatedly fails or refuses to produce the child for the evaluation; or (2) a child enrolls in a school of another public agency after the timeframe for initial evaluations has begun, and prior to a determination by the child’s previous public agency as to whether the child is a child with a disability. States should not report these exceptions in either the numerator (b) or denominator (a). If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in b.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 11 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 1.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 90.48% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received** | **(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 46 | 46 | 90.48% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Number of children included in (a) but not included in (b)**

0

**Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.**

**Indicate the evaluation timeline used:**

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted

**What is the State’s timeline for initial evaluations? If the State-established timeframe provides for exceptions through State regulation or policy, describe cases falling within those exceptions and include in (b).**

The State’s established timeline for an initial evaluation is 45 days and is consistent with the IDEA federal regulations at 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B). All of the students whose parental consent was received during the period of July 1, 2021 -June 30, 2022, were evaluated within the 45-day state-established timeline.

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The data used for this specific indicator are obtained from two primary sources: Goalview/EDPlan (student data management system), and Monthly Initial Evaluation Reports received from the Districts of all children referred for initial evaluation. The VIDE/SOSE captures all of the data elements for each child in an internal, self-calculating worksheet. The VIDE/SOSE uses this worksheet to compare the information in both data sets to ensure that the monthly initial evaluation reports and Goalview/EDPlan are consistent and have the same demographical and eligibility determination information as reported.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The VIDE/SOSE continues to provide support to the LEA Director and EDC personnel during the transition period (from Goalview) to EDPlan) to aid with the navigation of the new online student management system, specifically, archiving/uploading student-level data/documents to ensure student information is uploaded in the correct category within the student management system. This support will alleviate the VIDE/SOSE's inaccessibility of accessing the electronic records for the six (6) children inadvertently reported in the FFY 2020. Furthermore, the VIDE/SOSE was able to access hard copies of the student records of the six (6) children whose electronic records were noted as unavailable and determined that eligibility was determined for all six (6) children within the State established timeline of 45 days for an initial evaluation consistent with the IDEA federal regulations at 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B). For this reason, the VIDE/SOSE did not identify any findings of non-compliance.  
  
Based on the review of the updated data submitted monthly and completion of the transition to the new online student management system ("EDPlan"). the VIDE/SOSE is able to verify that the district in question is uploading the necessary student-level data in the new student management system("EDPlan").   
  
As part of its monitoring activities for the reporting period of July 1, 2021, thru June 30, 2022, the compliance monitoring unit conducted a desk audit to verify that the data reported for the 46 students, territory-wide were accurate, valid, and reliable.   
  
District 1 (St. Thomas/St. John) - a total of fourteen (14) children were referred for initial evaluation during the period of July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022. Of that total, 5 of the children referred did not qualify for special education services; 1 child is listed as inactive; 1 child who was evaluated has since exited and is no longer receiving special education services. Of the 14 children referred for initial evaluation, all were evaluated within the state-established timeline of 45 days.   
  
District 2 (St. Croix) - a total of thirty-two (32) children were referred for initial evaluation during the period of July 1, 2021, thru June 30, 2022. Of that total: 2 children did not qualify for special education services; 1 child is a speech-only student; 1 child was a transfer student who was timely evaluated. Of the 32 children referred for initial evaluation, all were evaluated within the state-established timeline of 45 days.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 11 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Virgin Islands reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, Virgin Islands must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Virgin Islands must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Virgin Islands must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

The VIDE/SOSE after careful review of the FFY 2020 data collected through desk audit and in order to address the required actions for the FFY 2021, it was determined that no findings of noncompliance for FFY 2020 is attributed.   
  
Even though the data for this indicator was reported as less than 100%, namely, as noted "the absence of the six (6) children included in (a) that are not in (b)" to address this the VIDE/SOSE further analyzes of the child-specific timeline determined that a discrepancy in the inputting and, specifically, the incorrect spelling of identifiable student information hindered the data collected through desk audit from making a determination on the timeliness of the initial evaluation. To prevent such critical data from hindering the State's ability to issue a finding, the VIDE/SOSE provided one-on-one targeted technical assistance to the specific district supervisors and further required District 1 to submit a CAP to address the issues which led to the incongruent language" level of compliance due to missing electronic records".  
  
The VIDE/SOSE implemented a new student data management system (EDPlan) in School Year 2022-2023 which captures the comprehensive and unique education collection and reporting process (referral, consent, evaluation/reevaluation, eligibility, IEP development, and finalization and exiting data). This new student data system has self-monitoring procedures with built-in-system-generated automated alerts which will assist the districts with any errors in inputting students' demographic information and ensuring the collection of valid and reliable data resulting in meeting compliance while improving results.  
  
VIDE/SOSE Clarification to OSEP Response   
  
The VIDE/SOSE has continued to collaborate with the LEA Director and supervisors in the district where the target of 100% was not met for FFY 2020. Subsequent to the filing of the FFY 2020 SPP/APR, the VIDE/SOSE began conducting a desk audit on a bi-monthly basis, of the district’s initial evaluation monthly report to ensure that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e. achieved 100% compliance) consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02). If discrepancies are noted, the submission source is notified of the discrepancy and required to verify, correct, and resubmit to the VIDE/SOSE within thirty (30) days, to ensure that the LEA is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.   
  
Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE required the LEA to submit a CAP to address the issue which led to the non-compliance and further provided one-on-one targeted technical assistance to the specific   
district supervisor. Based on the review of the updated data submitted monthly, coupled with the new student management system which captures the comprehensive education collection and   
reporting process, the district is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.

## 11 - OSEP Response

## 11 - Required Actions

# Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priorit**y: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

a. # of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.

b. # of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.

c. # of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

d. # of children for whom parent refusal to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.

e. # of children determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.

f. # of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.

Percent = [(c) divided by (a - b - d - e - f)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Category f is to be used only by States that have an approved policy for providing parents the option of continuing early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 12 - Indicator Data

**Not Applicable**

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 60.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 70.97% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 97.56% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. | 52 |
| b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday. | 2 |
| c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 37 |
| d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied. | 12 |
| e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays. | 0 |
| f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child’s third birthday through a State’s policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option. | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Numerator (c)** | **Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. | 37 | 38 | 97.56% | 100% | 97.37% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |

**Number of children who served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e, or f**

1

**Account for children included in (a), but not included in b, c, d, e, or f. Indicate the range of days beyond the third birthday when eligibility was determined and the IEP developed, and the reasons for the delays.**

There was one (1) child included in a, who had their IEP developed after age three (3). However, the IEP was developed seven (7) days after the child’s third (3rd), and services commenced eight (8) days after their third birthday.

**Attach PDF table (optional)**

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

The VIDE/SOSE collects data from each Local Education Agency (LEA) on all children referred from the Part C programs prior to age 3 for eligibility determination under the Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities (IDEA). These data are collected and entered into an internal database developed to capture all the data elements for each child referred. The data elements are as follows: (a) child’s name, (b) child’s date of birth, (c) date of transition meeting, (d) date child was determined eligible/not eligible, (e) date of IEP development, and (f) the date when services began/or refused by a parent.   
  
The following is the data source for this indicator (a) the State Monitoring system, (b) State Student Management System (“GoalView”), and (c) the State database that house all data for the respective reporting year FFY 2021 (e.g., children born between July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2019).

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The breakdown for the additional twelve (12) children in "D"are as follows: (a) four (4) children's files were closed by Part C programs which were due to the inability to schedule and confirm transition meetings, (b) one (1) child’s family was off-island for an indefinite period of time (c) five (5) children’s parents refused Part B services, and (d) two (2) children’s family moved out of the territory.   
  
In addition, there was one (1) child included in a, who had their IEP developed after age three (3), this IEP was developed seven (7) days after the child’s third (3rd), and services commenced eight (8) days after their third birthday.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 0 |  | 1 |

**FFY 2020 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 12 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Because Virgin Islands reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2020, Virgin Islands must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, Virgin Islands must report, in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, Virgin Islands must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.  
  
If Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020, although its FFY 2020 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2020.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

Subsequent to its FFY 2020 submission of the SPP/APR, the VIDE/SOSE issued a findings for its FFY 2020 ( School Year 2020/21) and FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/2022) for the noncompliance identified in this Indicator. Moreover to address OSEP requirements (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. To address Prong 1, the VIDE/SOSE reviewed the data reported for those children born between July 1, 2018, to June 30, 2019, through the District's monthly Part C to B reports. Based on these data review for FFY 2021, (School Year 2021/22), the LEA in question did not achieve 100% compliance for this Indicator. As such Prong 1, the noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was not corrected 1 year after identification. The State has not corrected the noncompliance in a timely manner as noted in OSEP's response to required actions. The State in order to address this reoccurring noncompliance have reinforced its monitoring protocols to include on-site review of child specific data with the LEA and has added an additional layer of weekly reports for the number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination. The State looks forward to reporting correction of the ongoing noncompliance as it increases its technical assistance and monitoring protocols to ensure the Effective General Supervision Part B/ Early Transition.

## 12 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands did not report on the actions it took to address the uncorrected noncompliance for this indicator.

## 12 - Required Actions

Because the Virgin Islands reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2021, the Virgin Islands must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 for this indicator. In addition, the Virgin Islands must demonstrate, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2020 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the Virgin Islands must report, in the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2021 and the LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2020: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.   
  
If the Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021, although its FFY 2021 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the Virgin Islands did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2021.

# Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator**: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data to be taken from State monitoring or State data system.

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency that is likely to be responsible for providing or paying for transition services, including, if appropriate, pre-employment transition services, was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

If a State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16, the State may, but is not required to, choose to include youth beginning at that younger age in its data for this indicator. If a State chooses to do this, it must state this clearly in its SPP/APR and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age.

**Instructions**

*If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select LEAs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, include data for the entire reporting year.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Targets must be 100%.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP’s response for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, improvement activities completed (e.g., review of policies and procedures, technical assistance, training, etc.) and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2020), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 13 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2009 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| Data | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition** | **Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 368 | 368 | 100.00% | 100% | 100.00% | Met target | No Slippage |

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

**Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State’s monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.**

During FFY 2021 (SY 2021-2022), the VIDE/SOSE collected data from the state student management system GoalView to create an internal spreadsheet consisting of all students with IEPs who are age 14 and over from July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2022. The collection of these data from its inception has always included all children in grades 9-12 (high school) including children 14 years of age and older. The VIDE/SOSE promotes the use of best practices with its LEAs as prescribed by National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) and requires the district LEAs to include children in high schools beginning with age 14 and older to ensure each child has an effective IEP that contains each of the required components for secondary transition.   
The VIDE/SOSE then reviewed through desk audit, the IEPS of each student listed on the spreadsheet using the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition (NTACT) Indicator 13 checklist for compliance with the regulatory transition requirements. If the required information was not contained in the IEP section of GoalView, the VIDE/SOSE reviewed additional documents in the student’s GoalView file to determine if the record contained evidence of compliance with the transition requirements. If any of the required evidence could not be found in the student’s file or in GoalView, the item on the checklist is marked (“no") for non-compliance.   
All 368 IEPs reviewed using the checklist were in compliance with the regulatory transition requirements.

| **Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Do the State’s policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16? | YES |
| If yes, did the State choose to include youth at an age younger than 16 in its data for this indicator and ensure that its baseline data are based on youth beginning at that younger age? | YES |
| If yes, at what age are youth included in the data for this indicator | 14 |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

During FFY 2021 (SY 2021-2022), the VIDE/SOSE reviewed 368 IEPs and reviewed each IEP to ensure they all contained the elements on the State's Indicator 13 Effective IEPs Checklist for compliance with the regulatory transition requirements. All 368 IEPs met the elements on The State checklist. The checklist was adapted by the NTACT resource center that added as part of the elements evidence that the student was invited to IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority. The State continues to work closely with the NTACT resource center to ensure that the most effective review of each element on the checklist is maintained. The effective writing of IEPs has continued to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators. Moreover, the State's scaling of ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners continues to be the main catalyst for building capacity for effective student outcomes at the LEA level. The State continues to rely on its national affiliates especially NTACT to guide its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020**

| **Findings of Noncompliance Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year** | **Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2020**

| **Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified** | **Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2020 APR** | **Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected** | **Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## 13 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 13 - OSEP Response

## 13 - Required Actions

# Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

**Results indicator:** Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.

B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.

C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

State selected data source.

**Measurement**

A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling****of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in secondary school****is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates of the target population. (See General Instructions on page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)*

Collect data by September 2022 on students who left school during 2020-2021, timing the data collection so that at least one year has passed since the students left school. Include students who dropped out during 2020-2021 or who were expected to return but did not return for the current school year. This includes all youth who had an IEP in effect at the time they left school, including those who graduated with a regular diploma or some other credential, dropped out, or aged out.

**I. *Definitions***

*Enrolled in higher education* as used in measures A, B, and C means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis in a community college (two-year program) or college/university (four or more year program) for at least one complete term, at any time in the year since leaving high school.

*Competitive employment* as used in measures B and C: States have two options to report data under “competitive employment”:

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

Option 2: States report in alignment with the term “competitive integrated employment” and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a “part-time basis” under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

*Enrolled in other postsecondary education or training* as used in measure C, means youth have been enrolled on a full- or part-time basis for at least 1 complete term at any time in the year since leaving high school in an education or training program (e.g., Job Corps, adult education, workforce development program, vocational technical school which is less than a two-year program).

*Some other employment* as used in measure C means youth have worked for pay or been self-employed for a period of at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes working in a family business (e.g., farm, store, fishing, ranching, catering services, etc.).

**II. *Data Reporting***

States must describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).

Provide the total number of targeted youth in the sample or census.

Provide the actual numbers for each of the following mutually exclusive categories. The actual number of “leavers” who are:

1. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;

2. Competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education);

3. Enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed);

4. In some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).

“Leavers” should only be counted in one of the above categories, and the categories are organized hierarchically. So, for example, “leavers” who are enrolled in full- or part-time higher education within one year of leaving high school should only be reported in category 1, even if they also happen to be employed. Likewise, “leavers” who are not enrolled in either part- or full-time higher education, but who are competitively employed, should only be reported under category 2, even if they happen to be enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program.

States must compare the response rate for the reporting year to the response rate for the previous year (e.g., in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, compare the FFY 2021 response rate to the FFY 2020 response rate), and describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.

The State must also analyze the response rate to identify potential nonresponse bias and take steps to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**III. *Reporting on the Measures/Indicators***

Targets must be established for measures A, B, and C.

Measure A: For purposes of reporting on the measures/indicators, please note that any youth enrolled in an institution of higher education (that meets any definition of this term in the Higher Education Act (HEA)) within one year of leaving high school must be reported under measure A. This could include youth who also happen to be competitively employed, or in some other training program; however, the key outcome we are interested in here is enrollment in higher education.

Measure B: All youth reported under measure A should also be reported under measure B, in addition to all youth that obtain competitive employment within one year of leaving high school.

Measure C: All youth reported under measures A and B should also be reported under measure C, in addition to youth that are enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program, or in some other employment.

Beginning with the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, include the State’s analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in their analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process. If the analysis shows that the response data are not representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State collected the data.

## 14 - Indicator Data

**Historical Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Baseline** | **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| A | 2009 | Target >= | 24.00% | 24.00% | 25.00% | 25.00% | 19.00% |
| A | 19.00% | Data | 24.14% | 23.53% | 26.15% | 25.49% | 19.51% |
| B | 2009 | Target >= | 60.50% | 61.00% | 62.00% | 62.00% | 65.00% |
| B | 59.00% | Data | 68.97% | 73.53% | 72.31% | 76.47% | 65.85% |
| C | 2009 | Target >= | 81.50% | 81.50% | 82.00% | 83.00% | 73.00% |
| C | 80.00% | Data | 82.76% | 82.35% | 83.08% | 90.20% | 73.17% |

**FFY 2020 Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target A >= | 19.50% | 20.00% | 20.50% | 21.00% | 21.50% |
| Target B >= | 66.00% | 66.50% | 67.00% | 67.50% | 68.00% |
| Target C >= | 75.50% | 77.00% | 78.50% | 80.00% | 80.50% |

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

During FFY 2021 (School Year 2020-2021), the VIDE/SOSE expanded and reconfigured its stakeholder components with a concentrated focus on indicator clusters to ensure expert representation and analyses in all target areas of this indicator and all indicators in this cluster. This reconfiguration includes but it not limited to the following: parents of students with disabilities, grade level and content experts in secondary transition services, regular and special education personnel, district directors, district coordinators, and supervisors, District Office of Special Education personnel, Educational Diagnostic personnel, private business sector, inter-agency partners, and other outside and linking agencies. The VIDE/SOSE divided the stakeholders into cluster groups.   
The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its stakeholders for this indicator to review the data for FFY 2020. The stakeholders for this cluster were tasked with an analysis of the FFY 2020 data. Stakeholders were tasked with identifying areas for improvements geared towards ensuring the representativeness of the demographic of responders, increasing the total number of responders, particularly for underrepresented groups, and identifying potential response bias as well as providing strategies to reduce response bias for youth who had IEPs and were no longer in secondary school. A comparative analysis of Target Leaver and Respondent Representation for all leavers in the FFY 2020 data was carefully reviewed to determine the conditions needed for a higher response rate and reducing response bias. This process allowed stakeholders to select demographic groups for responder’s representativeness as required for FFY 2021. The Stakeholders analysis captured that most responders demonstrated outcomes that were effective and it was concluded that effectiveness or positive outcomes contributed to a higher likelihood of responders responding to the survey. The State enters data and analyzes the data for this indicator through the State’s Post School Outcomes Calculator, the calculator produces tabular and graphical presentations from data entered into excel worksheets. The data represent the response rate disaggregated by disability group, gender, race/ethnicity, and exiting modes. The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicator approved the analysis of the demographic of response representativeness by the disability category of Specific Learning Disabled (SLD) and recommended increasing the networking with other transition agencies to provide direct services to students who exit in any other mode other than receiving a high school diploma or certificate of completion.

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total number of targeted youth in the sample or census | 88 |
| Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school | 47 |
| Response Rate | 53.41% |
| 1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school | 10 |
| 2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school | 21 |
| 3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed) | 8 |
| 4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed). | 0 |

| **Measure** | **Number of respondent youth** | **Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A. Enrolled in higher education (1) | 10 | 47 | 19.51% | 19.50% | 21.28% | Met target | No Slippage |
| B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2) | 31 | 47 | 65.85% | 66.00% | 65.96% | Did not meet target | No Slippage |
| C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4) | 39 | 47 | 73.17% | 75.50% | 82.98% | Met target | No Slippage |

**Please select the reporting option your State is using:**

Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.

**Response Rate**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2020** | **2021** |
| Response Rate | 37.96% | 53.41% |

**Describe strategies that will be implemented which are expected to increase the response rate year over year, particularly for those groups that are underrepresented.**

The VIDE/SOSE uses a written survey with multiple choice questions that are mailed with an accompanying letter with the rationale for the questionnaire, which requests that the student or their family complete and returns the survey to the SOSE in a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The SOSE mailed 88 (June 2022), all of whom are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. These surveys were mailed to students who left school after the end of the 2020-2021 school year (including the summer session). The VIDE/SOSE was able to collect responses from mailed and telephonic surveys for 47 out of the 88 leavers for a 53.41% response rate. The increase of the response rate of 16.47% above FFY 2020 (last year) response rate is attributed to a heightened collaboration with districts, parents, and stakeholders that broaden the scope of data collection for accuracy in contact information for leavers as well as continuous data checks from schools' for up-to-date student demographics. Despite the increase in the percentage of responders, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to increase its efforts to broaden its networking capacity to encourage parents, students, and other public agencies in the collection of post-school outcomes. The VIDE/SOSE recognizes that changes in exiters demographic information limit its capacity to access a wider audience and reducing unexpected changes would certainly increase the State's ability to widen the data collection and increase the response rate. As previously mentioned, the State will employ the following strategies to increase its capacity to reach a wider audience by (1) accessing in real-time the contact information of exiters who leave before the end of the school year and profiling those exiters who exit schools at the end of the school year, and (2) all parents of a child with a disability in high school will be interviewed to capture accurate demographic information for promoting optimum post-school service delivery options.   
  
Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will implement the State Exiting Profile as another strategy that will heighten the VIDE/SOSE collaboration with parents and supporting agencies for seamless delivery of post-school services. Ultimately the VIDE/SOSE will implement these strategies to increase the response rate and reduce under/over-representation among all exiters regardless of disabling condition, ethnicity, and gender. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE will engage its public relations division to promote the collection of these data by using its advertising campaigns and networks throughout the school calendar year.   
  
Additionally, high school Special Education teachers will receive weekly reminders through their Student Data Information System portfolio, EdPlan of the requirements to complete a Student Exiting Profile for all student exiters. The VIDE/SOSE will implement these strategies as a means to increase the response rate, demonstrate representativeness, and promote a response from all sections of youth who had IEPs and are no longer in high school.

**Describe the analysis of the response rate including any nonresponse bias that was identified, and the steps taken to reduce any identified bias and promote response from a broad cross section of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.**

The SOSE conducted an item analysis using the State PSO calculator to determine nonresponse bias on gender, graduation/exiting status, race/ethnicity, and disability category of the 47 responders. The SOSE item analysis for all responders produced valuable data and display counts and representativeness for subgroups in each demographic category. For instance, the percentages of the respondents were as follows; from the 47 responders, 29 were in the SLD category for a respondent representation of 61.70%. 61.70% of the SLD respondent representativeness responded from a 52.27% target leaver representation for a 9.43% over-representation. 4 responders from 8 target leavers were in the ED category for a -0.58% negative difference or under-representation. 11 responders from 21 target leavers were in the ID category for a -0.46% negative difference or under-representation. 3 responders were among the 4 disability categories ranging from Autism, Multiple Disabilities, Hearing Impairment, and Other Health Impairments for a respondent representativeness of 6.38% from 14.77% for a -8.39% negative difference or under-representation; The State’s analysis on dropout demonstrated a 14.89% from a 20.45% for a -5.56% negative difference or under-representation. Among those who responded, 53.41% were among the categories enrolled in post-secondary education, competitively employed, and or enrolled in some other post-secondary education, training, or competitively employed. Despite the State's efforts in collecting data from all leavers, the analysis of the responders produced data of over-representation of the SLD category as well as under-representation of the other disability categories grouped together as those numbers combined were smaller. The State's efforts in collecting exiting data from the ED and ID category demonstrates a negative difference below the +/-3%. The State acknowledges that the higher response rate from the SLD category may be attributed to a more positive school outcome and thus in its collection the State employed its maximum efforts to reach all leavers for this reporting year thus improving the response rate as well as a collection of other disability categories to minimize non-response bias.   
For FFY 2021 the State PSO produced data of the responders and non-responders groups. Of the majority of children with disabilities who exited school with an IEP, 80.68% were of the black racial category; 12.5% were Hispanic (not white); 4.55% identified as others; and 2.27% were white. Of the 47 responders, the State’s analysis on race/ethnicity showed that 89.36% of responders were of the black racial category; 17.02% were Hispanic (not white); 2.13% identified as others; and 2.13% were white. The State analysis demonstrated that respondent representation of 8.68% over-representation was in the black racial category; 4.52% were in the Hispanic; and a margin of difference of +/- 3 for the race category others and white showed no difference in representativeness for these racial groups. For FFY 2021, the data collected from all responders in 4 of the 5 disability categories produced no difference in representativeness therefore, no response bias is attributed to this group of responders. The State will continue to increase collaboration with the LEAs to ensure that students and parents are fully engaged in the planning of post-school objectives in the early stages of high school and to ensure that students are given the opportunity to achieve the best outcomes in high schools for effective post-school outcomes. The data analyzed for representativeness of the demographic of SLD students, as approved by stakeholders, and data analyzed for representativeness of the race/ethnicity of students with disability who left high school all these data collected and analyzed are representative of the demographic of youth in the United State Virgin Islands who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Include the State’s analyses of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. States must include race/ethnicity in its analysis. In addition, the State’s analysis must include at least one of the following demographics: disability category, gender, geographic location, and/or another demographic category approved through the stakeholder input process.**

For FFY 2021 as with previous years, the majority of children with disabilities who exited school with an IEP, 80.68% were of the black racial category; 12.5% were Hispanic (not white); 4.55% identified as others; and 2.27% were white. Of the 47 responders, the State’s analysis on race/ethnicity showed that 89.36% of responders were of the black racial category; 17.02% were Hispanic (not white); 2.13% identified as others; and 2.13% were white. The State analysis demonstrated that respondent representation of 8.68% over-representation were in the black racial category; 4.52% were in the Hispanic; and a margin of difference of +/- 3 for the race category others and white showed no difference in representativeness for these racial groups. The State analysis for gender demonstrated that 25.53% respondent of 30.68% of target leaver showed a -5.15% negative difference or under-representation were females; 74.47% respondents of 69.32% of target leavers were in the minority/ethnicity category (not white/non-Hispanic) for a 5.15% over-representation. The data collected from all responders in 4 of the 5 disability categories produced no difference in representativeness therefore, the data analyzed for representativeness of the demographic of SLD students, as approved by stakeholders, and data analyzed for representativeness of the race/ethnicity of students with disability who left high school all these data analyzed are representative of the demographic of youth in the United State Virgin Islands who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. Moreover, the collection and analysis of exiters for this indicator that demonstrates representativeness of the demographic of youth who are no longer in secondary schools is an ongoing process that has increased the VIDE/SOSE's capacity in the collection of these data. The VIDE/SOSE collection protocols of these data to improve its response rate and reduce under/over-representation of the demographics of youth will require a more robust and direct approach to ensuring that every student exiting high school completes a "Student Exiting Profile" for ensuring the full continuum of services options available.

**The response data is representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. (yes/no)**

YES

**If no, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics.**

**Describe the metric used to determine representativeness (e.g., +/- 3% discrepancy in the proportion of responders compared to target group).**

The SOSE conducted an item analysis using the State PSO calculator on gender, graduation/exiting status, race/ethnicity and disability category of the 47 responders. The SOSE item analysis for all responders produced valuable data and display counts and representativeness for subgroup in each demographic category. For instance, the percentages of the responder were as follows; from the 47 responders 29 were in the SLD category for a respondent representation of 61.70%. 61.70% of the SLD respondent representativeness responded from a 52.27% target leaver representation for a 9.43% over-representation. 4 responders from 8 target leavers were in the ED category for a -0.58% negative difference or under-representation. 11 responders from 21 target leavers were in the ID category for a -0.46% negative difference or under-representation. 3 responders were among the 4 disability categories ranging from Autism, Multiple Disability, Hearing Impairment, and Other Health Impairments for a respondent representativeness of 6.38% from a 14.77% for a -8.39% negative difference or under-representation; The State’s analysis on dropout demonstrated a 14.89% from a 20.45% for a -5.56% negative difference or under-representation.   
For FFY 2021 as with previous years, the majority of children with disabilities who exited school with an IEP, 80.68% were of the black racial category; 12.5% were Hispanic (not white); 4.55% identified as others; and 2.27% were white. Of the 47 responders, the State’s analysis on race/ethnicity showed that 89.36% of responders were of the black racial category; 17.02% were Hispanic (not white); 2.13% identified as others; and 2.13% were white. The State analysis demonstrated that respondent representation of 8.68% over-representation were in the black racial category; 4.52% were in the Hispanic; and a margin of difference of +/- 3 for the race category others and white showed no difference in representativeness for these racial groups.

| **Sampling Question** | **Yes / No** |
| --- | --- |
| Was sampling used? | NO |
| **Survey Question** | **Yes / No** |
| Was a survey used? | YES |
| If yes, is it a new or revised survey? | NO |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

In FFY 2021, the VIDE/SOSE obtained demographic information (students’, parent/guardians’ name and contact information, telephone numbers for students and their parents/guardians, date that the student graduated or exited school, and mailing address) from the State student data system (“GoalView”) and the Division of Planning, Research, and Evaluation (PR&E). The VIDE/SOSE in June of 2022, one (1) year after students left school, the SOSE mails a survey to every student with an IEP who graduated or otherwise exited school at the end of the 2020-2021 school year (including leavers from the end of 2021 summer session).  
During FFY 2021, the VIDE/SOSE has continued to work closely with the LEA to improve outcomes for children and youth with disabilities in the four cluster indicators by engaging in ongoing professional development through its national affiliates and resource partners thus building capacity and guiding its members on the most effective practices and structures to improve graduation rates, decrease dropouts, develop quality IEPs and transition planning, and more importantly improve post-school outcomes.

## 14 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not analyze the response rate to identify potential non-response bias. Virgin Islands must report the required information in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
In the FFY 2021 SPP/APR, the State also must report whether the FFY 2021 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions Virgin Islands is taking to address this issue. Virgin Islands must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

For FFY 2021(School Year 2021-2022), the VIDE/SOSE collected and analyzed data from responders (47 out of 88) 53.41% response rate represented an increase in the response rate from the 37.96% response rate of FFY 2020 data. This increase is attributed to a heightened collaboration across the districts to effect transition services that would enable students to exit high school with the best outcomes. Additionally, the collection of this data was collected from students and or parents/family designees. All questions on the survey were administered orally for those surveys completed through telephonic interviews and no questions returned through the mail were left unanswered. In the event that questions were left unanswered, the VIDE/SOSE attempts to collect this information by telephonic means. In the U.S. Virgin Islands, the geographic location is germane to all its inhabitants and its composition and accessibility are not a hindrance for its inhabitants. The data collected and analyzed for this indicator demonstrated a 9.43% over-representation in the category of SLD. For FFY 2021, the SLD category had a 52.27 % for target leavers this is the highest number of all target leavers. 61.70% of the SLD respondent responded for a 9.43% over-representation in the U.S. Virgin Islands moreover, the data showed no difference in the representativeness of the demographic of youth in the other 5 disability category. The data collected from all responders in 4 of the 5 disability categories produced no difference in representativeness therefore, no response bias is attributed to these groups of leavers. The data analyzed for representativeness of the demographic of SLD students, as approved by stakeholders, and data analyzed for representativeness of the race/ethnicity of students with disability who left high school all these data analyzed are representative of the demographic of youth in the United State Virgin Islands who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

## 14 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands reported that the response data for this indicator were representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school. However, in its narrative, the Virgin Islands reported, "61.70% of the SLD respondent representativeness responded from a 52.27% target leaver representation for a 9.43% over-representation." The Virgin Islands also reported in its narrative, "3 responders were among the 4 disability categories ranging from Autism, Multiple Disability, Hearing Impairment, and Other Health Impairments for a respondent representativeness of 6.38% from a 14.77% for a -8.39% negative difference or under-representation; The State’s analysis on dropout demonstrated a 14.89% from a 20.45% for a -5.56% negative difference or under-representation." Additionally, the Virgin Islands reported in its narrative, "The State analysis demonstrated that respondent representation of 8.68% over-representation were in the black racial category; 4.52% were in the Hispanic; and a margin of difference of +/- 3 for the race category others and white showed no difference in representativeness for these racial groups." Therefore, it is unclear whether the response data was representative.

## 14 - Required Actions

In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must report whether the FFY 2022 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the Virgin Islands is taking to address this issue. The Virgin Islands must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

# Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results Indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 15 - Indicator Data

Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1 Number of resolution sessions | 1 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints | 11/02/2022 | 3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements | 0 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improvement targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 15 and 16. The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicators were reintroduced to the methodology and measurements which closely looks at Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision, in specific, Dispute Resolution and Mediation. As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of l children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool,), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2008 | 100.00% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  | .00% |
| Data |  |  | 100.00% | 100.00% |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **3.1(a) Number resolutions sessions resolved through settlement agreements** | **3.1 Number of resolutions sessions** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 1 |  |  | 0.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The VIDE/SOSE had fewer than 10 resolution sessions for the FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) APR reporting period. Thus, the VIDE/SOSE is not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10.

## 15 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 15 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2021. The Virgin Islands is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

## 15 - Required Actions

# Indicator 16: Mediation

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority**: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3(B))

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (E*MAPS*)).

**Measurement**

Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

**Instructions**

*Sampling is not allowed.*

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution mediations reaches 10 or greater, develop baseline and targets and report on them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data under IDEA section 618, explain.

States are not required to report data at the LEA level.

## 16 - Indicator Data

**Select yes to use target ranges**

Target Range not used

**Prepopulated Data**

| **Source** | **Date** | **Description** | **Data** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1 Mediations held | 1 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints | 0 |
| SY 2021-22 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests | 11/02/2022 | 2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints | 1 |

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State’s data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

**Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input**

For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) the VIDE/SOSE continues its collaboration with the State's Indicator clusters which concentrates on analyzing data, up-scaling strategies, and improvement targets for specific indicators. This collaboration ensures that each cluster of indicators has expert representativeness in all areas and, especially, child/grade-specific outcomes. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s Stakeholders group for this cluster of indicators are 15 and 16. The Cluster Stakeholders for this indicators were reintroduced to the methodology and measurements which closely looks at Effective General Supervision Part B/General Supervision, in specific, Dispute Resolution and Mediation. As with other cluster indicators, the State carefully selected the members of this group which includes and is not limited to parents/guardians of l children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, planning research and evaluation, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool,), content area specialists, grade-level, educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies.

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2005 | 81.20% |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **2019** | **2020** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data |  |  |  |  |  |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target >= |  |  |  |  |  |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

| **2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints** | **2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints** | **2.1 Number of mediations held** | **FFY 2020 Data** | **FFY 2021 Target** | **FFY 2021 Data** | **Status** | **Slippage** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 100.00% | N/A | N/A |

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

The VIDE/SOSE had fewer than 10 mediation sessions for the FFY 2021(School Year 2021/22) APR reporting period. Thus, the VIDE/SOSE is not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediation sessions is less than 10.

## 16 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

## 16 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2021. The Virgin Islands is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

## 16 - Required Actions

# Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

**Instructions and Measurement**

**Monitoring Priority:** General Supervision

The State’s SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

**Measurement**

The State’s SPP/APR includes an SSIP that is a comprehensive, ambitious, yet achievable multi-year plan for improving results for children with disabilities. The SSIP includes each of the components described below.

**Instructions**

**Baseline Data*:*** The State must provide baseline data that must be expressed as a percentage and which is aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

**Targets*:*** In its FFY 2021 SPP/APR, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide measurable and rigorous targets (expressed as percentages) for each of the six years from FFY 2021 through FFY 2025. The State’s FFY 2025 target must demonstrate improvement over the State’s baseline data.

**Updated Data:** In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, due February 1, 2023, the State must provide updated data for that specific FFY (expressed as percentages) and that data must be aligned with the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. In its FFYs 2021 through FFY 2025 SPPs/APRs, the State must report on whether it met its target.

Overview of the Three Phases of the SSIP

It is of the utmost importance to improve results for children with disabilities by improving educational services, including special education and related services. Stakeholders, including parents of children with disabilities, local educational agencies, the State Advisory Panel, and others, are critical participants in improving results for children with disabilities and should be included in developing, implementing, evaluating, and revising the SSIP and included in establishing the State’s targets under Indicator 17. The SSIP should include information about stakeholder involvement in all three phases.

*Phase I: Analysis:*

- Data Analysis;

- Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity;

- State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities;

- Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies; and

- Theory of Action.

*Phase II: Plan* (which, is in addition to the Phase I content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Infrastructure Development;

- Support for local educational agency (LEA) Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices; and

- Evaluation.

*Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation* (which, is in addition to the Phase I and Phase II content (including any updates) outlined above:

- Results of Ongoing Evaluation and Revisions to the SSIP.

**Specific Content of Each Phase of the SSIP**

Refer to FFY 2013-2015 Measurement Table for detailed requirements of Phase I and Phase II SSIP submissions.

Phase III should only include information from Phase I or Phase II if changes or revisions are being made by the State and/or if information previously required in Phase I or Phase II was not reported.

***Phase III: Implementation and Evaluation***

In Phase III, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. This includes: (A) data and analysis on the extent to which the State has made progress toward and/or met the State-established short-term and long-term outcomes or objectives for implementation of the SSIP and its progress toward achieving the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities (SiMR); (B) the rationale for any revisions that were made, or that the State intends to make, to the SSIP as the result of implementation, analysis, and evaluation; and (C) a description of the meaningful stakeholder engagement. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

A. Data Analysis

As required in the Instructions for the Indicator/Measurement, in its FFYs 2021 through 2025 SPP/APR, the State must report data for that specific FFY (expressed as actual numbers and percentages) that are aligned with the SiMR. The State must report on whether the State met its target. In addition, the State may report on any additional data (e.g., progress monitoring data) that were collected and analyzed that would suggest progress toward the SiMR. States using a subset of the population from the indicator (e.g., a sample, cohort model) should describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR if that was not described in Phase I or Phase II of the SSIP.

B. Phase III Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation

The State must provide a narrative or graphic representation, e.g., a logic model, of the principal activities, measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State’s last SSIP submission (i.e., Feb 2022). The evaluation should align with the theory of action described in Phase I and the evaluation plan described in Phase II. The State must describe any changes to the activities, strategies, or timelines described in Phase II and include a rationale or justification for the changes. If the State intends to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications, the State must describe how the data from the evaluation support this decision.

The State must summarize the infrastructure improvement strategies that were implemented, and the short-term outcomes achieved, including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up. The State must describe the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on anticipated outcomes to be obtained during FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023).).

The State must summarize the specific evidence-based practices that were implemented and the strategies or activities that supported their selection and ensured their use with fidelity. Describe how the evidence-based practices, and activities or strategies that support their use, are intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (i.e., behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child outcomes. Describe any additional data (i.e., progress monitoring data) that was collected to support the on-going use of the evidence-based practices and inform decision-making for the next year of SSIP implementation.

C. Stakeholder Engagement

The State must describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts and how the State addressed concerns, if any, raised by stakeholders through its engagement activities.

Additional Implementation Activities

The State should identify any activities not already described that it intends to implement in the next fiscal year (e.g., for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023for the FFY 2021 APR, report on activities it intends to implement in FFY 2022, i.e., July 1, 2022-June 30, 2023)) including a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes that are related to the SiMR. The State should describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.

## 17 - Indicator Data

**Section A: Data Analysis**

**What is the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR)?**

The Virgin Islands Department of Education (VIDE), State Office of Special Education’s (SOSE) State Identified Measurable Results (SiMR), is to increase the percentage of third-grade students with disabilities who score proficient or above on state-wide reading and language assessments.

**Has the SiMR changed since the last SSIP submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State using a subset of the population from the indicator (*e.g.*, a sample, cohort model)? (yes/no)**

NO

**Is the State’s theory of action new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Please provide a link to the current theory of action.**

The VIDE/SOSE is providing the link to its Theory of Action.  
  
https://vide.vi/our-divisions/special-education/#ssip

**Progress toward the SiMR**

**Please provide the data for the specific FFY listed below (expressed as actual number and percentages)*.***

**Select yes if the State uses two targets for measurement. (yes/no)**

NO

**Historical Data**

| **Baseline Year** | **Baseline Data** |
| --- | --- |
| 2014 | 8.61% |

**Targets**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FFY** | **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **2025** |
| Target>= | 11.11% | 11.50% | 12.00% | 12.50% | 13.00% |

**FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **10** | FFY 2020 Data | FFY 2021 Target | FFY 2021 Data | **Status** | **Slippage** |
|  | 90 |  | 11.11% |  | N/A | N/A |

**Provide the data source for the FFY 2021 data.**

The VIDE/SOSE's data source for FFY 2021 (School Year 2021-22) Year 7 reporting of the SSIP is the Virgin Islands Department of Education, Division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE), the primary data source for all statewide assessment data for all students including students with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE in turn collects the raw disaggregated student and school-level data from the division of PRE and the pre-populated data submitted via the EDFacts data platform for file specifications 175 and 178 and the data groups 583,584 and 588), to ascertain the performance of students with disabilities in third-grade, namely those who score proficient or above on state-wide reading and language assessments.

**Please describe how data are collected and analyzed for the SiMR**.

During FFY 2021, (School Year 2021/22) Year 7 reporting of Phase III, the VIDE/SOSE reconvened testing on statewide assessment for all students including students with disabilities. Students in grades 3 through 8 and 11 were tested to ascertain their academic performance on reading, language arts, and math assessments. The Virgin Islands Department of Education, State Office of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I), and the Division of Planning Research Evaluation (PRE) are the primary data sources for all statewide assessment data for children with disabilities. The VIDE/SOSE in turn collects the raw disaggregated student and school-level data from the division of PRE and the pre-populated data submitted via the EDFacts data platform for file specifications 175 and 178 and the data groups 583,584 and 588). Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE analyzes the data to ensure completeness, a grouping of proficiency levels, and a tabulation of proficiency rates for students on state-wide reading and language assessments.  
Additionally, the territory-wide general assessments in English Language Arts (ELA) and math (Smarter Balanced ELA and math), in this instance, ELA are administered to students in an online format except for those students that require large print or braille booklets based on their Individualized Education Program (IEP). Data for the student’s administered Statewide Assessment are collected utilizing the Online Reporting System (ORS). Further, results are available for access approximately ten (10) days after the student completes their assessment (summative). Access to specific student-level, classroom, and school-wide data is contingent on the role of the individual. For example, teachers' view is restricted to the student and classroom levels, whereas district and school leadership have access to student-specific, classroom, and school-wide data. These data are disaggregated by subgroups, for instance, students with disabilities.

**Optional: Has the State collected additional data *(i.e., benchmark, CQI, survey)* that demonstrates progress toward the SiMR? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any additional data collected by the State to assess progress toward the SiMR.**

The Virgin Islands Department of Education, District Office of Data and Assessments provides the testing schedule for iReady adaptive Diagnostic test. This diagnostic test is utilized to ascertain what specific skill student needs to cultivate. Thus, testing occurs at the beginning of the school year, mid-year, and end of the School Year (October, January, and May). iReady data for each student are collected and analyzed through the (name of the dashboard) which utilizes results-specific algorithms utilizing historical and current data to identify and or accelerate evidence-based instructional strategies. Trained district and school leadership, and content area specialists/coordinators to extract iReady data to devise student-level, classroom-wide supportive academic and behavioral intervention programs aimed at increasing skill areas such as English Language Arts. In addition, the District Office of Data and Assessments utilizes a data dashboard as the mechanism to triangulate data from district data sources, for example, iReady, and Power School. The dashboard has the capabilities such as extracting attendance and performance data for all subgroups in an array of measurements. Moreover, the Districts Offices of the Superintendents, Curriculum and Instruction Offices of District Data and Assessment team members review iReady Data; following the reviews, the teams conduct data chats with the respective school leaders and school data teams. Professional development (PD) is conducted on district professional development days, and also when target professional development is needed. Schools also share and discuss the data chart worksheets with each parent, and in some instances, students on the higher grade level students lead the data chats with their parents.

**Did the State identify any general data quality concerns, unrelated to COVID-19, that affected progress toward the SiMR during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

YES

**Describe any data quality issues, unrelated to COVID-19, specific to the SiMR data and include actions taken to address data quality concerns.**

The VIDE/SOSE, existing challenges are evident, particularly with the ongoing stakeholder (internal and external) conversations; relating to the analysis and use of other data points (qualitative and quantitative) that will assist with identifying the following: strengths, challenges, and progress relative to the Coherent Improvement Strategies. These steps are critical in gauging the effectiveness of: professional development activities, evidence-based instructional academic and behavioral strategies, and improving student achievement. For these reasons, the VIDE/SOSE recognizes that it must identify action steps that will expeditiously identify areas of student, teacher, and school professional development needs for administrators and school teams. Moreover, there remains a need to restructure existing communication and meeting calendars to facilitate ongoing discussions between district leadership, school leadership, and school data (improvement) teams.   
  
The division of C & I and PRE are aligning the collection and dissemination of data collected through the statewide assessment to better inform stakeholders on the progress of the VIDE Accountability Workbook as it aligns the needs of the VIDE/SOSE evaluation of the SiMR to upscale strategies to achieve the SiMR. The alignment of these 2 divisions to integrate data on statewide assessment into the curriculum will facilitate the collaboration among schools to plot data and conduct data chats that will become the focal point in planning the progress to achieving the SiMR.

**Did the State identify any data quality concerns directly related to the COVID-19 pandemic during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Section B: Implementation, Analysis and Evaluation**

**Please provide a link to the State’s current evaluation plan.**

The VIDE/SOSE’s current evaluation plan can be accessed on the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s homepage web portal www.vide.vi homepage by first clicking the "Our Divisions" tab, then clicking on Special Education.

**Is the State’s evaluation plan new or revised since the previous submission? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of each infrastructure improvement strategy implemented in the reporting period:**

In an attempt to improve the infrastructure, and chiefly optimize the collection and reporting capabilities for student level, compliance, results, and Section 616 and Section 618 during FFY 2021, (School Year 2021/22) Year 7 of implementation the VIDE/SOSE commenced with the preparation for the conversion to an improved online web-based special education student data management system (“EDPlan”). The VIDE/SOSE ensured that revisions and upgrades met the requirements of the United States Department of Education (USDOE), Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP), specifically, the following processes and data collection such as referral, consent and evaluation and Individuated Education Program (IEP) information. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE met weekly with the vendors of EDPlan and discussed questions and concerns, additional needs, and status updates. Further, this student management system provides all documents as mandated by 34 CFR §300.600. The VIDE/SOSE hosted both virtual and onsite training for each LEA, for all State Office of Special Education personnel, administrators, special education teachers, school social workers, psychologists, physical, occupational, and speech and language therapists, system district managers, and paraprofessionals. The VIDE/SOSE revised and disseminated the following special education document; Notice of Procedural Safeguards (various languages), State Office of Special Education Rules, and Special Education Procedural Manual. Moreover, the VIDE/SOSE VIDE/SOSE collected qualitative and quantitative data during its Continuous Results Focused Monitoring System (CIRFMS) virtual monitoring activity for Year 7 of the SSIP’s implementation.

**Describe the short-term or intermediate outcomes achieved for each infrastructure improvement strategy during the reporting period including the measures or rationale used by the State and stakeholders to assess and communicate achievement. Please relate short-term outcomes to one or more areas of a systems framework (e.g., governance, data, finance, accountability/monitoring, quality standards, professional development and/or technical assistance) and explain how these strategies support system change and are necessary for: (a) achievement of the SiMR; (b) sustainability of systems improvement efforts; and/or (c) scale-up.**

The VIDE/SOSE collaboration with internal stakeholders is an ongoing function that informs the progress of the State’s infrastructure to upscale strategies and introduces the best evidence-based practices that will sustain the strategies for achieving the SiMR. In determining the sustainability of the State’s system, a review of the data collected showed the need for optimizing the collection and reporting of student-level data to ensure that students, parents, teachers, and education stakeholders have access to the highest level of valid and reliable data. The VIDE/SOSE utilizes several methods of collecting input for implementing systemic changes. Through its comprehensive strategic review, the State collects data from its stakeholder’s quarterly meetings and combines this with other infrastructure frameworks to evaluate its level of quality standards. The need for integrating specific-student level and grade-level strategies in a central repository has been an essential need in the State’s infrastructure for sustainability and upscaling of the CIS and TOA. The rebranding of the State’s new student data management system is the integration of the most up-to-date data platform for ensuring that all students have scientific-based strategies and goals for achieving grade-level achievement and alternate achievement standards at the school level. The use of a system with the most effective strategies and the highest level of quality control ensures that the user is afforded quality professional development and technical support to ensure best practices and outcomes

**Did the State implement any new (newly identified) infrastructure improvement strategies during the reporting period? (yes/no)**

NO

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each infrastructure improvement strategy and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Although challenges remain during FFY 2021, (School Year 2021/22) Year 7 of implementation of its SSIP, the VIDE/SOSE remain committed to heightening the level of attainment, improvements, and modifications to the infrastructure that supports the utilization of SSIP initiatives, organizational transformations, implementation of CIS, and increasing the capacity of the VIDE/SOSE's multi-tiered system of supports (RtI and PBIS) which remains the focal point of the VIDE/SOSE. During Year 7, the VIDE/SOSE utilized all available opportunities to continue its collaborative and targeted efforts in analyzing and sustaining short and long-term outcomes, particularly sustainability, and scaling-up up each component in its Logic Models(LM). Further, the VIDE/SOSE is cognizant that it must intensify each infrastructure improvement strategy to achieve the expected outcome (s). Thus, for the reporting of Phase III Year 8 of implementation, the VIDE/SOSE will heighten its collaborative efforts with schools PLCs and report the progress of the CIS with VIDE's CORE Stakeholders. These collaborative opportunities will be used as a mechanism to introduce/reintroduce its Logic Models (LM); to novice and tenured school administrators, coordinators, school improvement team, and CORE stakeholders, with special emphasis on the coherent improvement strategies contained within the LM models. Furthermore, specific emphasis will be placed on connecting, reconnecting, and enhancing stakeholder relationships to include heightening the understanding of the roles all of which are the vehicle for improving and attaining the VIDE/SOSE’s SiMR. The VIDE/SOSE will ensure that it utilizes all collaborative opportunities for PD activities, particularly those relating to supporting, sustaining, and scaling up evidence-based strategies. More importantly, make certain that selected PD’s are meaningful and intentional, as well as aligned with its SSIP’s improvement strategies. Also, the VIDE/SOSE will work to achieve the following: revisit roles (district and school), collaborate with each superintendent in both districts to identify a liaison, engage in dialogue with state and district leaders to solicit CORE SSIP stakeholder committee members, identify and collaborate teams’ roles; and secure and procure contractual services to provide the highest levels of evidence-based professional development instructional strategies. Furthermore, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to use Table D as the major mechanism to assist with all-inclusive planning and execution of PD activities as well as data collection and analysis in order to evaluate CIS and anticipated outcomes.

**List the selected evidence-based practices implement in the reporting period:**

The SSIP CIS implementation of the Logic Model activities is the guiding mechanism for continued progress in the implementation of evidence-based practices for FFY 2020 and FFY 2021. Despite the change to a hybrid model during FFY 2020, the State’s implementation of activities is ongoing. To ensure ongoing and scaling up professional development, the State partnered with the Division of C&I and the Regional Educational Laboratory Northeast and Islands (REL. NEI) to provide a series of webinars in both districts that sustain the State’s LM. The webinars focused on strategies to implement high-quality instructional practices for English learners in the general education environment and were presented on a recurring basis.   
  
The use of Differentiated Instruction/Learning (DI) in districts’ schools has been the main course of instructional pedagogy supported by schools including pilot schools. The level of implementation with fidelity of this mode of instruction will increase the performance of reading scores and ultimately achieve the State’s SiMR. The State utilizes the LM to evaluate the implementation of DI for evidence of academic growth.

**Provide a summary of each evidence-based practices.**

During FFY 2021, (School Year 2021/22) Year 7 the VIDE/SOSE implementation and quality of professional development were still experiencing challenges related to the effects of school closures due to the Pandemic. While restrictions to a full personal learning environment were limited to a hybrid model, the State’s CIS provided for ongoing supportive professional development. The state worked closely with its core stakeholders to ensure the use of evidence-based practices was sustained thus, district schools engaged in using data collection from iReady, and Literacy Interventions (Fountas and Pinnell) to guide schools' implementation of best practices. Additionally, for FFY 2021 the VIDE SIP building Literacy Proficiency in Reading and Language and data platforms are in pre-pandemic mode these platforms will be used by schools' PLCs to drive academic instruction and decisions at the school level.  
  
For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) Year 7 reporting of Phase III, all evidence-based practices were carried out through online webinars. The ongoing provision of webinars to support professional development for elementary school was in response to the limitations of in-person instruction and co-existing limitations of switching to a full virtual instructional platform. The webinars were all geared towards improving outcomes, specifically, literacy and language acquisition. The webinars helped build capacity in using instructional strategies within a multi-tiered system of support and behavioral support system which are all part of the SSIP LM.

**Provide a summary of how each evidence-based practice and activities or strategies that support its use, is intended to impact the SiMR by changing program/district policies, procedures, and/or practices, teacher/provider practices (e.g. behaviors), parent/caregiver outcomes, and/or child /outcomes.**

During FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) year 7 of implementation the VIDE/SOSE continued to support activities such as professional development for teachers premised on strategies in its Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports(PBIS) Logic Model, which is aimed at improving school-wide academic and behavioral practices. The VIDE/SOSE continues to support activities such as professional development for teachers through off and on-island modes that are premised on strategies in its Positive Behavioral Intervention and Supports(PBIS) Logic Model, which is aimed at improving school-wide academic and behavioral practices.

**Describe the data collected to monitor fidelity of implementation and to assess practice change.**

During FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/2022) for Year 7 of implementation the VIDE/SOSE used its Continuous Improvement Results Focused Monitoring System as a means of assessing/supporting the level of practice and program effectiveness.

**Describe any additional data (e.g. progress monitoring) that was collected that supports the decision to continue the ongoing use of each evidence-based practice.**

The VIDE/SOSE secured iReady and Statewide proficiency data for FFY (School Year 2021/2022), Year 7 of implementation, the results of these data sets to support the need not only to continue the ongoing use of evidenced-based strategies(EBS), but the need to intensify its collaboration, supports that will aid with increasing the knowledge and skills of school teams, special and regular education teachers, data teams on the use of effective EBS to increase student performance/growth.

**Provide a summary of the next steps for each evidence-based practices and the anticipated outcomes to be attained during the next reporting period.**

Although challenges remain the VIDE/SOSE remain committed to heightening the level of attainment, improvements, and modifications to the infrastructure that supports the utilization of SSIP initiatives, organizational transformations, implementation of CIS, and increasing the capacity of the VIDE/SOSE's multi-tiered system of supports (RtI and PBIS) remains the focal point of the VIDE/SOSE. During Year 7, the VIDE/SOSE utilized all available opportunities to continue its collaborative and targeted efforts in analyzing and sustaining short and long-term outcomes, particularly sustainability, and scaling-up up each component in its Logic Models (LM). Further, the VIDE/SOSE is cognizant that it must intensify each infrastructure improvement strategy to achieve the expected outcome (s). Thus, for the reporting of Phase III Year 8 of implementation, the VIDE/SOSE will heighten its collaborative efforts with schools PLCs and report the progress of the CIS with VIDE's CORE stakeholders. These collaborative opportunities will be used as a mechanism to introduce/reintroduce its Logic Models (LM); to novice and tenured school administrators, coordinators, school improvement team, and CORE stakeholders, with special emphasis on the coherent improvement strategies contained within the LM models. Furthermore, specific emphasis will be placed on connecting, reconnecting, and enhancing stakeholder relationships to include heightening the understanding of the roles all of which are the vehicle for improving and attaining the VIDE/SOSE’s SiMR. The VIDE/SOSE will ensure that it utilizes all collaborative opportunities for PD activities, particularly those relating to supporting, sustaining, and scaling up evidence-based strategies, more importantly, make certain that selected PD’s are meaningful and intentional, as well as aligned with its SSIP’s improvement strategies. Also, the VIDE/SOSE will work to achieve the following: revisit roles (district and school), collaborate with each superintendent in both districts to identify a liaison, engage in dialogue with state and district leaders to solicit CORE SSIP stakeholder committee members, identify and collaborate teams’ roles; and secure and procure contractual services to provide the high levels of evidence-based professional development instructional strategies. Furthermore, the VIDE/SOSE will continue to use Table D as the major mechanism to assist with all-inclusive planning and execution of PD activities as well as data collection and analysis in order to evaluate CIS and anticipated outcomes.  
  
Additionally, the VIDE/SOSE through collaboration with CORE Stakeholders will concentrate its efforts on the re-alignment of its evidence-based professional development that will address the need of all elementary schools in the territory to employ all the necessary resources in the recovery of loss of learning caused by the Pandemic. The VIDE Core Stakeholders have met with all school leaders and activated a system of accountability across all schools. This collaboration with school-building leaders in ensuring accountability across academic performance has led to a collection of specific academic and behavioral data that will highlight the scope and level of MTSS implementation across all schools. School building leaders will ensure that the use of a measure such as rate of instructions and other interventions are maximized for all Tiers 2 and 3 learners, additionally, the use of these measures will formulate the basis for all academic core instruction across all grade levels. This will improve academic performance and achievement in reading for all English Learners. School Planning Learning Committees will align the necessary interventions for optimum academic achievement. For example, each school will be instructed to identify the areas of academic and behavioral supports contributing to learning loss/gaps in order to improve academic achievement in one hand, and improve reading proficiency in statewide assessments on the other hand. The VIDE/SOSE CORE Stakeholders' short-term goal is to improve the reading proficiency of all English Learners in third grade. The anticipated outcomes are to improve with efficacy the implementation of evidence-based teaching strategies and improve the overall performance of reading proficiency for all English Learners, especially, third-grade reading proficiency which is aligned with the Virgin Islands Department of Education Strategic Plan.

**Does the State intend to continue implementing the SSIP without modifications? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, describe how evaluation data support the decision to implement without any modifications to the SSIP.**

The VIDE/SOSE will continue its implementation of its SSIP, with an intensive focus on a robust partnership with other VIDE CORE internal stakeholders on the implementation of evidence-based strategies that support the activities within the VIDE/SOSE's Logic Models. Some of these strategies are unpacking the data (data points) Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and Differentiated Instruction (DI),

**Section C: Stakeholder Engagement**

Description of Stakeholder Input

For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) the VID/SOSE continues with the expanded mode for Indicator clusters which concentrates on specific indicators. This ensures that each cluster of indicators has representatives in all areas. For instance, the VIDE/SOSE’s SSIP cluster of indicators is 3, 5, and SSIP. Moreover, this redesign includes the following, and is not limited to parents/guardians of preschool children receiving special education and related services, district and school administrators, district directors of special education, school counselors, preschool special and regular education teachers (preschool), content area specialists, grade-level educational diagnostic team members, and outside linking agencies. Furthermore, the VIDE/SOSE will work closely with the District Office of Special Education with district-level activities such as parental roundtable meetings and monthly newsletters.

**Describe the specific strategies implemented to engage stakeholders in key improvement efforts.**

During FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) Year 7 implementation, VIDE/SOSE strategically used district leadership and departmental meeting opportunities to inform, share progress and areas for improvement and engage its stakeholders.

**Were there any concerns expressed by stakeholders during engagement activities? (yes/no)**

NO

**Additional Implementation Activities**

**List any activities not already described that the State intends to implement in the next fiscal year that are related to the SiMR.**

The VIDE/SOSE has no newly described activities to be implemented for the reporting FFY 2022. (School Year 2022/23). In year 8 of implementation, the VIDE/SOSE will continue with the activities included in Table D which was submitted in April 2020.

**Provide a timeline, anticipated data collection and measures, and expected outcomes for these activities that are related to the SiMR.**

The VIDE/SOSE has not identified any new activities.

**Describe any newly identified barriers and include steps to address these barriers.**

For FFY 2021 (School Year 2021/22) Year 8 reporting for the SSIP, further, throughout the reporting phases, the VIDE/SOSE's noted that it anticipated barriers to developing a plan with the CORE internal stakeholders. For example, District and State Offices of Curriculum and Instruction District Superintendent's Offices, District Offices of Data and Assessment, and School, and District Professional Learning Communities (PLCs). One of the steps to address the barriers is collaborating with the respective stakeholder members to brainstorm and devise a plan in partnership with these stakeholder group members. The aim of this plan is that it is closely linked to each Logic Model, namely the Short and Long-Term Outcomes. Moreover, through this Plan, the VIDE/SOSE will have a mechanism to ensure continuous stakeholder communication and cooperative collaborative efforts to improve performance for third-grade students with disabilities on reading language arts assessments. The next stage is to commence with a series of intentional dialogues with State and District Leadership to include District Content Coordinators to ascertain the level of support needed that will impact the implementation of evidence-based instructional strategies geared towards improving teacher knowledge and skills that will ultimately impact the performance of all students, particularly students with disabilities in the third grade.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional).**

The VIDE/SOSE reconvened its Cluster Stakeholders for Indicators 3, 5, and 17 in order to review and recommend targets that demonstrate improvements for this indicator over the 5-year targets of this SPP/APR. The State Cluster Stakeholders used the data collected and reported for this indicator to build a framework for building capacity within the State Curriculum and Instructions Literacy Improvement Plan and the VIDE School-Wide Strategic Improvement Plan designed to improve literacy outcomes for ELA and increase the proficiency rates in reading comprehension for children with disabilities in grades 3 as specified in the State Improvement Measurable Results. The Cluster Stakeholders verified the data collected for this indicator which is the percentage of third-grade students with disabilities who score proficient or above on state-wide reading and language assessments and verified this data collected. The Stakeholders agreed that the data represented is as followed: Students who scored proficient 10 divided by the total number of students assessed 90 = 11.11% Students in 3rd grade scored proficient or above on state-wide reading and language assessments.

## 17 - Prior FFY Required Actions

Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2020. Virgin Islands must provide the required data for FFY 2021 in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR.   
  
OSEP notes that one or more of the Indicator 17 attachment(s) included in Virgin Islands FFY 2020 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education’s IDEA website. Therefore, Virgin Islands must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

**Response to actions required in FFY 2020 SPP/APR**

As required by OSEP the VIDE/SOSE’s attachments for FFYs 2020 Indicator B17 can be accessed on the Virgin Islands Department of Education’s homepage web portal www.vide.vi homepage by first clicking the "Our Divisions" tab, then clicking on Special Education.

## 17 - OSEP Response

The Virgin Islands revised its FFY 2021 through FFY 2025 targets for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.  
  
The Virgin Islands did not provide data for FFY 2021 for this Indicator; however, the Virgin Islands provided data to the Department under Title I of ESEA using EdFacts file specifications 178 and 188.  
  
The Virgin Islands did not provide the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data table.

## 17 - Required Actions

The Virgin Islands did not, as required by the Measurement Table, provide: (1) FFY 2021 data for this indicator, and (2) the numerator and denominator descriptions in the FFY 2021 SPP/APR Data table.   
In the FFY 2022 SPP/APR, the Virgin Islands must report all required data and components in this indicator. Reporting data under this indicator is critical so that the Virgin Islands, OSEP and the public can determine the Virgin Island’s performance and whether and how the Virgin Islands met its targets for this indicator. OSEP may consider taking additional actions if the Virgin Islands is unable to report the required data in its FFY 2022 SPP/APR.
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## RDA Matrix

**US Virgin Islands**

2023 Part B Results-Driven Accountability Matrix

**Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination[[14]](#footnote-15)**

| **Percentage (%)** | **Determination** |
| --- | --- |
| 66.67% | Needs Assistance |

**Results and Compliance Overall Scoring**

|  | **Total Points Available** | **Points Earned** | **Score (%)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Results** | 8 | 2 | 25.00% |
| **Compliance** | 18 | 17 | 94.44% |

**2023 Part B Results Matrix**

**Reading Assessment Elements**

| **Reading Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | \* | 1 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**Math Assessment Elements**

| **Math Assessment Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Average Percentage of 3rd through 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Participating in Regular Statewide Assessments** | \* | 1 |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 4th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Scoring at Basic or Above on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |
| **Percentage of 8th Grade Children with Disabilities Included in Testing on the National Assessment of Educational Progress** | N/A | N/A |

\*Due to privacy concerns the Department has chosen to suppress this calculation.

**Exiting Data Elements**

| **Exiting Data Elements** | **Performance (%)** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Dropped Out Over Previous 3 Years** | 28 | 0 |
| **Percentage of Children with Disabilities who Graduated with a Regular High School Diploma Over Previous 3 Years\*\*** | 54 | 0 |

\*\*When providing exiting data under section 618 of the IDEA, States are required to report on the number of students with disabilities who exited an educational program through receipt of a regular high school diploma. These students meet the same standards for graduation as those for students without disabilities. As explained in 34 C.F.R. § 300.102(a)(3)(iv), in effect June 30, 2017, “the term regular high school diploma means the standard high school diploma awarded to the preponderance of students in the State that is fully aligned with State standards, or a higher diploma, except that a regular high school diploma shall not be aligned to the alternate academic achievement standards described in section 1111(b)(1)(E) of the ESEA. A regular high school diploma does not include a recognized equivalent of a diploma, such as a general equivalency diploma, certificate of completion, certificate of attendance, or similar lesser credential.”

**2023 Part B Compliance Matrix**

| **Part B Compliance Indicator[[15]](#footnote-16)** | **Performance (%)** | **Full Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2020** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator 4B: Significant discrepancy, by race and ethnicity, in the rate of suspension and expulsion, and policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with specified requirements.** | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 9: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services due to inappropriate identification.** | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 10: Disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories due to inappropriate identification.** | 0.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 11: Timely initial evaluation** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Indicator 12: IEP developed and implemented by third birthday** | 97.37% | NO | 2 |
| **Indicator 13: Secondary transition** | 100.00% | N/A | 2 |
| **Timely and Accurate State-Reported Data** | 93.32% |  | 1 |
| **Timely State Complaint Decisions** | 100.00% |  | 2 |
| **Timely Due Process Hearing Decisions** | N/A |  | N/A |
| **Longstanding Noncompliance** |  |  | 2 |
| **Specific Conditions** | None |  |  |
| **Uncorrected identified noncompliance** | None |  |  |

## Data Rubric

**US Virgin Islands**

FFY 2021 APR[[16]](#footnote-17)

|  | **Part B Timely and Accurate Data -- SPP/APR Data** |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **APR Indicator** | **Valid and Reliable** | **Total** |
| **1** | 1 | 1 |
| **2** | 1 | 1 |
| **3A** | 1 | 1 |
| **3B** | 1 | 1 |
| **3C** | 1 | 1 |
| **3D** | 1 | 1 |
| **4A** | 1 | 1 |
| **4B** | 1 | 1 |
| **5** | 1 | 1 |
| **6** | 1 | 1 |
| **7** | 1 | 1 |
| **8** | 1 | 1 |
| **9** | 1 | 1 |
| **10** | 1 | 1 |
| **11** | 1 | 1 |
| **12** | 1 | 1 |
| **13** | 1 | 1 |
| **14** | 1 | 1 |
| **15** | 1 | 1 |
| **16** | 1 | 1 |
| **17** | 0 | 0 |
|  | **Subtotal** | 20 |
| **APR Score Calculation** | **Timely Submission Points** - If the FFY 2021 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right. | 5 |
|  | **Grand Total** - (Sum of Subtotal and Timely Submission Points) = | 25 |

|  |  | **618 Data[[17]](#footnote-18)** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table** | **Timely** | **Complete Data** | **Passed Edit Check** | **Total** |
| **Child Count/**  **Ed Envs**  **Due Date: 4/6/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Personnel Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **Exiting Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| **Discipline Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **State Assessment Due Date: 12/21/2022** | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| **Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/2/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **MOE/CEIS Due Date: 5/4/22** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
|  |  |  | **Subtotal** | 19 |
| **618 Score Calculation** |  |  | **Grand Total** (Subtotal X 1.23809524) = | 23.52 |

| **Indicator Calculation** |  |
| --- | --- |
| A. APR Grand Total | 25 |
| B. 618 Grand Total | 23.52 |
| C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) = | 48.52 |
| Total N/A Points in APR Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0 |
| Total N/A Points in 618 Data Table Subtracted from Denominator | 0.00 |
| **Denominator** | 52.00 |
| D. Subtotal (C divided by Denominator\*) = | 0.9332 |
| E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) = | 93.32 |

**\*Note that any cell marked as N/A in the APR Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1, and any cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data Table will decrease the denominator by 1.23809524.**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**APR and 618 -Timely and Accurate State Reported Data**

**DATE: February 2023 Submission**

**SPP/APR Data**

**1) Valid and Reliable Data** - Data provided are from the correct time period, are consistent with 618 (when appropriate) and the measurement, and are consistent with previous indicator data (unless explained).

**Part B 618 Data**

**1) Timely** – A State will receive one point if it submits all EDFacts files or the entire EMAPS survey associated with the IDEA Section 618 data collection to ED by the initial due date for that collection (as described the table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **618 Data Collection** | **EDFacts Files/ EMAPS Survey** | **Due Date** |
| Part B Child Count and Educational Environments | C002 & C089 | 1st Wednesday in April |
| Part B Personnel | C070, C099, C112 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Exiting | C009 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Discipline | C005, C006, C007, C088, C143, C144 | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B Assessment | C175, C178, C185, C188 | Wednesday in the 3rd week of December (aligned with CSPR data due date) |
| Part B Dispute Resolution | Part B Dispute Resolution Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in November |
| Part B LEA Maintenance of Effort Reduction and Coordinated Early Intervening Services | Part B MOE Reduction and CEIS Survey in EMAPS | 1st Wednesday in May |

**2) Complete Data** – A State will receive one point if it submits data for all files, permitted values, category sets, subtotals, and totals associated with a specific data collection by the initial due date. No data is reported as missing. No placeholder data is submitted. The data submitted to EDFacts aligns with the metadata survey responses provided by the state in the State Supplemental Survey IDEA (SSS IDEA) and Assessment Metadata survey in EMAPS. State-level data include data from all districts or agencies.

**3) Passed Edit Check –** A State will receive one point if it submits data that meets all the edit checks related to the specific data collection by the initial due date. The counts included in 618 data submissions are internally consistent within a data collection

## Dispute Resolution



## How the Department Made Determinations

Below is the location of How the Department Made Determinations (HTDMD) on OSEP’s IDEA Website.  How the Department Made Determinations in 2023 will be posted in June 2023. Copy and paste the link below into a browser to view.

[https://sites.ed.gov/idea/how-the-department-made-determinations/](https://nam10.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fsites.ed.gov%2Fidea%2Fhow-the-department-made-determinations%2F&data=05%7C01%7Cdan.royal%40aemcorp.com%7C56561a053eed4e4dffea08db4cd0ea7f%7C7a41925ef6974f7cbec30470887ac752%7C0%7C0%7C638188232405320922%7CUnknown%7CTWFpbGZsb3d8eyJWIjoiMC4wLjAwMDAiLCJQIjoiV2luMzIiLCJBTiI6Ik1haWwiLCJXVCI6Mn0%3D%7C3000%7C%7C%7C&sdata=REJfNg%2BRs0Gk73rS2KzO2SIVRCUhHLglGd6vbm9wEwc%3D&reserved=0)

1. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. Prior to the FFY 2020 submission, the State used a different data source to report data under this indicator. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Data suppressed due to small cell size. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. For a detailed explanation of how the Compliance Score, Results Score, and the Results-Driven Accountability Percentage and Determination were calculated, review "How the Department Made Determinations under Section 616(d) of the *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* in 2023: Part B." [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. The complete language for each indicator is located in the Part B SPP/APR Indicator Measurement Table at: <https://sites.ed.gov/idea/files/2023_Part-B_SPP-APR_Measurement_Table.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. In the SPP/APR Data table, where there is an N/A in the Valid and Reliable column, the Total column will display a 0. This is a change from prior years in display only; all calculation methods are unchanged. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1 point is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the SPP/APR Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. In the 618 Data table, when calculating the value in the Total column, any N/As in the Timely, Complete Data, or Passed Edit Checks columns are treated as a ‘0’. An N/A does not negatively affect a State's score; this is because 1.23809524 points is subtracted from the Denominator in the Indicator Calculation table for each cell marked as N/A in the 618 Data table. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)